

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.



---

VOL. 166.

PUBLISHED IN

*JANUARY & APRIL, 1888.*

---

LONDON:

---

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1888.

AP4  
Q2  
V.100

31AT2 QHO  
V12R3V1BU

---

---

LONDON:

Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS, Limited,  
Stamford Street and Charing Cross.

---

---



THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

ART. I.—*The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, including an Autobiographical Chapter.* Edited by his son, Francis Darwin. 3 vols. London, 1887.

**E**XPECTATION of no common kind has for the past five years been aroused by the report, that a memoir was, naturally enough, being prepared of the great biologist whose mortal remains were laid in Westminster Abbey on the 26th of April, 1882. The expectation was by no means confined to the men of science who had been his colleagues or competitors, but was shared by thousands to whom the methods and the labours of naturalists are strange. The effect of that series of works which, beginning in 1859, had one after another, throughout a period of more than twenty years, appeared from the pen of the late Mr. Darwin, had been felt by almost all classes of educated men and women—not only in this country, but throughout the civilized world—felt, it is true, in very varying degrees, and exciting very divergent opinions. To say that such an effect had never before been produced is to say little; for it is only in the present age that an author has had the possibility of addressing so vast a multitude of readers. But even the present age has not seen another author whose views have obtained a circulation, and at least partial acceptance, so wide; and this, notwithstanding that the views were repugnant to the sentiments of many, revolutionary in the sight of others, and presenting grave difficulties to those who regarded them most favourably. Into any controversy on those views it is not our intention here to enter. Controversy now were useless. Most thinking people have long since ‘taken sides,’ and it cannot be denied that, though some still hold out, as they have ever done, against ‘Darwinism’—in all sincerity renouncing its doctrines—their number has for several years past proved but an insignificant proportion to that of their opponents, and is yet daily diminishing.

Vol. 166.—No. 331.

B

Whether

8563

Whether we deem the expectation of which we have just spoken, to be justified or disappointed by the work whose title stands at the head of this article, is a matter of which we shall leave our readers to judge by the tone of our remarks as we proceed. There is no wonder indeed that the expectation should have been high, when the circumstance is taken into consideration, that Mr. Darwin's biographer was announced to be that one of his accomplished sons who, from his natural tastes and education, had been most associated with his father's labours, and whose name had publicly appeared as that of his father's assistant on the title-page of one of his father's works. Mr. Francis Darwin has already for some years been recognized as an able expositor of the new school of botanical science, and the merit of his original investigations had obtained for him, in the year of his father's death, admission into the Royal Society. In his attempt to fulfil the pious task he had undertaken, he has had the great advantage of an autobiographical sketch by the subject of his memoir, which forms the second chapter of the first volume. To this we shall presently return, since the personal recollections of almost any man, written by himself, possess an interest far greater than that with which the pen of the most expert biographer can invest the life of another.

That the author, or, as he modestly terms himself, the editor of these volumes, should be a 'Darwinian,' is but natural, and in that character it is as natural that the Doctrine of Descent should have strong hold upon him. Hence no false pride can be attributed to him for devoting his first chapter to 'The Darwin Family.' The name variously spelt of old time—Derwent, Darwen, Darwynne, and so on—is obviously a 'place-name,' but still suggests no certain origin, for there is nothing to show whether its first bearer came from Cumberland, Derbyshire or Yorkshire, in all of which counties it is still perpetuated by localities. The first known ancestor of the family, as discovered by that trustworthy and laborious genealogist, the late Colonel Chester, lived nearly 400 years ago at Marton, in the north-western limits of Lincolnshire; and his successor in the fourth generation became also possessed of landed estates at Manton, in the same county, situated in that curiously wild district which lies on the right bank of the Trent before it falls into the Humber, and even now preserves much more of its natural aspect than can be seen in most parts of England. This Darwin, William by name, left a son, another William, who served on the King's side in the Civil War, and was consequently impoverished, though he recovered his lands. Entering, however, at the Bar, he ultimately became Recorder of Lincoln,

Lincoln, but, in the meanwhile, he married the daughter of a serjeant-at-law, Erasmus Earle, and so brought into the family a Christian name that subsequently became celebrated. The son of the Recorder, again called William, married the heiress of Robert Waring, of Staffordshire; and she inherited from the family of Lassells, or Lascelles, an estate at Elston, near Newark, which has ever since remained the property of her descendants. From this union two sons were born. The line of the eldest, of whom nothing important is recorded, ended in daughters; but the second son, Robert, seems to have been no ordinary man, and was termed by the antiquary Stukeley, 'a person of curiosity'—a phrase meaning in those days something very different from what it would now, though even in its modern sense it is justified by certain rhymes, of which he was the reputed author,\* handed down in the family:—

'From a morning that doth shine,  
From a boy that drinketh wine,  
From a wife that talketh Latine,  
Good Lord deliver me!'

It is suspected that the third line in this 'litany' was suggested by the fact of his having married a very learned lady, though her name is not given, and whether the conduct of any one of his four sons prompted the second line is not known. At any rate, the eldest died unmarried, at the respectable age of ninety-two, having cultivated a taste for botany and for poetry. On the former subject he published a work, which reached a third edition, but on the latter he is not known to have printed anything. Both tastes, however, were far more strongly developed in his younger brother, the Erasmus Darwin whose fame, considerable as it was during his lifetime, had fallen into obscurity, or was only recollected by the admirable parodies of his sonorous versification by the authors of the 'Antijacobin,' until people were reminded of its existence by the works of his grandson, whose 'Life and Letters' we here notice.

Thus it will be seen that the ancestors of the deceased naturalist had displayed no little intellectual power, but it remains to speak of Robert Waring, the third son of this Erasmus.† He, too, took up medicine; and, marrying a daughter

of

\* The form in which they are given may be original, but the idea conveyed in them is undoubtedly borrowed, for it may be found in an old French proverb that has been often quoted.

† His two other sons were evidently no common men. Charles, the eldest, having adopted the medical profession, was of extraordinary promise when he was cut off in his twenty-first year, by a wound received in dissecting, and Erasmus, the second, amused himself when a boy, by numbering the houses and the people

of Wedgwood, of Etruria, carried on a prosperous practice as a physician in Shrewsbury, where, at a house called *The Mount*, two sons were born to him. The elder, another Erasmus, the friend of Carlyle, lived a bachelor in London, and died in 1881. The younger, the subject of this work, was Charles Robert,\* who describes his father as being 'the wisest man he had ever known,' and entertained so great an affection for him that anything he said was received with almost implicit faith. When, in after years, this son visited the old Shrewsbury abode, the tenant of which with mistaken kindness stayed with him all the while, he wrote: 'If I could have been alone in that greenhouse for five minutes, I know I should have been able to see my father in his wheel-chair as vividly as if he had been before me.' Some amusing traits of this gentleman, who, as is obvious, was most highly esteemed by his friends, are recorded, but here they need not be mentioned. We wish we knew more of his wife Susannah, since celebrated men are said to take so many of their highest qualities from their mothers; but we are merely told of 'a miniature of her, with a remarkably sweet and happy face, bearing some resemblance to the portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds of her father; a countenance expressive of the gentle and sympathetic nature which Miss Meteyard ascribes to her.' She died in 1817, predeceasing her husband by thirty-two years, and leaving her youngest son, Charles, who was born in 1809, a boy of eight.

Having thus paid homage to the principle of heredity, as becomes the reviewer of the 'Life and Letters' of him who first tried to show how it works in Nature, we must turn to our main business, and the autobiographical sketch, before-mentioned, immediately demands notice. A more pleasant task seldom falls upon one of our calling than to dwell upon the chapter of this work containing the 'Recollections of the Development of my Mind and Character,' which Mr. Darwin wrote some five or six years before his death, for more delightful reading is not easily to be met with. The simplicity, with which the author describes the events of his early days, is in almost every sentence, and in almost every phrase, characteristic of the man. Equally characteristic of him is it that this charming production was intended to be seen only

---

of Lichfield, his result being found, when a real census was taken, to be nearly accurate. He was a man of varied tastes, and was not the less known for his intimacy with Boulton, the engineer, and with Day, the philosophical, if eccentric, author of 'Sandford and Merton.'

\* The second Christian name seems never to have been used by him upon whom it was bestowed, and he will doubtless go down to posterity as he was known to his contemporaries—plain Charles Darwin.

by

by his children and children's children, and that he should say:—

'I have attempted to write the following account of myself, as if I were a dead man in another world looking back at my own life. Nor have I found this difficult, for life is nearly over with me. I have taken no pains about my style of writing.'—Vol. i. p. 27.

This autobiography is less a minute self-dissection, as we have heard some term it, than a general record of things that happened and a close description, as if after study with a microscope, of the tastes, the pursuits, and the motives—which a memory 'extensive,' as he calls it, even if 'hazy' as to particulars, enabled him to recall—and especially of the motives. These are set down in the plainest language possible, and without the least attempt at extenuation when they are not perfect. Not a Rousseau could more candidly—if Rousseau was candid—pen his confessions. But there is little that the severest moralist can find fault with, and nothing that one can perceive after the days of childhood and early youth. The most reprehensible, perhaps, was the habit of 'inventing deliberate falsehoods, and this was always done for the sake of causing excitement'; but that we suspect at the age of eight years is not a very uncommon failing—especially with a motherless boy—and even then was not without a sequel of repentance:—

'One little event during this year [1817] has fixed itself very firmly in my mind, and I hope that it has done so from my conscience having been afterwards sorely troubled by it; it is curious as showing that apparently I was interested at this early age in the variability of plants! I told another little boy (I believe it was Leighton, who afterwards became a well-known lichenologist and botanist), that I could produce variously coloured polyanthuses and primroses by watering them with certain coloured fluids, which was of course a monstrous fable, and had never been tried by me.'—Vol. i. p. 28.

Considering the light that Mr. Darwin subsequently shed on some of those very plants, especially their dimorphism, this was indeed a singular foreshadowing! The beating of a puppy 'simply from enjoying the sense of power'—a thing many a child has done—lay afterwards heavily on his mind; the more so, perhaps, from his strong affection for dogs, as he tells us he 'was an adept in robbing their love from their masters.' He was, however, even then, or shortly after, endued not merely with the moral sense, but with deep religious feelings; since, while a pupil of Dr. Butler's, at Shrewsbury, he used to go home in the longer intervals between 'callings-over' and locking up at night, and he writes:—

'I remember

'I remember in the early part of my school life that I often had to run very quickly to be in time, and from being a fleet runner was generally successful; but when in doubt I prayed earnestly to God to help me, and I well remember that I attributed my success to the prayers and not to my quick running, and marvelled how generally I was aided.'—Vol. i. p. 31.

Mr. Darwin was one of the many to whom a public 'school as a means of education . . . was simply a blank.' For composition he had no faculty, and, of course, the usual result followed:—

'I had many friends, and got together a good collection of old verses, which by patching together, sometimes aided by other boys, I could work into any subject. Much attention was paid to learning by heart the lessons of the previous day; this I could effect with great facility, learning forty or fifty lines of Virgil or Homer whilst I was in morning chapel; but this exercise was utterly useless, for every verse was forgotten in forty-eight hours. I was not idle, and with the exception of versification, generally worked conscientiously at my classics, not using cribs. The sole pleasure I ever received from such studies, was from some of the odes of Horace, which I admired greatly.'—Vol. i. p. 32.

Euclid he was taught by a private tutor, and distinctly remembered 'the intense satisfaction which the clear geometrical proofs gave' him. With equal delight he took in the principle of the vernier when it was explained to him by his uncle—the father of Mr. Francis Galton. And with these mathematical relaxations—evidently showing that by fit training his mathematical faculties might have been (notwithstanding what he afterwards said) advantageously developed—the historical plays of Shakspear, Thomson's 'Seasons,' and the poetry of Scott and Byron, were pleaurably read, while his future career was proclaimed by the collecting of minerals and *dead* insects. The limitation in this last respect was due to his sister, who seems to have stood to him much in the place of a mother, for, after consulting her, he 'concluded that it was not right to kill insects for the sake of making a collection' of them! The reading of Gilbert White's 'Natural History of Selborne' naturally set him watching the habits of birds, and, he writes, 'In my simplicity, I remember wondering why every gentleman did not become an ornithologist.' Then chemistry, towards the close of his school-life, had its share of attention, for thereat his elder brother Erasmus worked hard; and so much was the younger one interested in a study so unprecedented at Shrewsbury school that he was nicknamed 'Gas,' and was publicly rebuked by Dr. Butler for wasting his time on such useless subjects—'he called

called me very unjustly a "poco-curante," and as I did not understand what he meant, it seemed to me a fearful reproach.\*—Vol. i. p. 35.

At the age of sixteen he was wisely removed by his father from a place of such unprofitable employment to him, and was sent to join his elder brother in studying medicine in the University of Edinburgh. Here the instruction was altogether by means of lectures which, except those on chemistry, he found to be intolerably dull. But the perception that he would eventually enjoy a competent fortune checked any strenuous effort to pursue the ancestral profession, and moreover his sensitive nerves forbade his attendance in the operating room—"two cases," which he only half saw, "fairly haunted me for many a long year." Here, too, happened a curious thing which unconsciously may have had its effect on his future career. He became well acquainted with Robert Edmond Grant, afterwards Professor of Zoology in University College, London, and one day as they were walking together Grant—

'burst forth in high admiration of Lamarck and his views on evolution. I listened,' continues Mr. Darwin, 'in silent astonishment, and, as far as I can judge, without any effect on my mind. I had previously read the "Zoonomia" of my grandfather, in which similar views are maintained, but without producing any effect on me. Nevertheless it is probable that the hearing rather early in life such views maintained and praised may have favoured my upholding them under a different form in my "Origin of Species." At this time I admired greatly the "Zoonomia"; but on reading it a second time after an interval of ten or fifteen years, I was much disappointed; the proportion of speculation being so large to the facts given.'†—Vol. i. p. 38.

\* In curious contrast with this, we may perhaps be allowed here to mention what Mr. Blomefield—much better known by his former name of Leonard Jenyns—tells us in an interesting little autobiographical sketch which he has lately printed. Having learned some chemistry at the private school where he was before being sent, at the age of thirteen years, to Eton, he there set up, in his dame's house, with the help of a cutler in the town, and his foreman, the apparatus required for the production of coal gas, at that time a complete novelty in the way of illumination. A few years after, about 1817, young Jenyns was taken by Sir George Duckett to one of Sir Joseph Banks's Sunday evening parties, and introduced to the latter, then President of the Royal Society, as the 'Eton boy who lit his room with gas.'—*Chapters in my Life*, pp. 31, 33 (Bath, 1887).

† The use of the word "evolution" in this extract, though natural enough, seems to anticipate by many years its application in the particular sense intended. Mr. Darwin states that, after coming to London, Grant 'did nothing more in science, a fact which has always been inexplicable to me.' Surely the explanation may lie in his holding opinions on this subject so much at variance with those of nearly all the men of science that he must have met. Under such circumstances silence would be reasonable; but we must also bear in mind Professor Huxley's testimony (vol. ii. p. 188) that Grant's 'advocacy was not calculated to advance the cause' of Evolution.

On



On the whole Mr. Darwin's residence in Edinburgh does not seem to have been a success. The sole effect, produced by the geological lectures to which he listened, was 'the determination never as long as I lived to read a book on geology, or in any way to study the science'—a determination which gave way, as we shall immediately see, under the more genial treatment of teachers whom he afterwards met. In the meanwhile—

'How I did enjoy shooting! but I think that I must have been half-consciously ashamed of my zeal, for I tried to persuade myself that shooting was almost an intellectual employment; it required so much skill to judge where to find most game and to hunt the dogs well.'—Vol. i. p. 43.

In those good times popular opinion or a sense of duty had not debarred the occupant of the pulpit from the use of the gun. The passion for shooting therefore was not considered a hindrance to the choice of the clerical profession, and Dr. Darwin, finding that his son had no disposition to pursue a medical career, proposed that he should take Orders. He asked time to consider a suggestion so momentous; but, after a course of 'Pearson on the Creed,' and a few other divinity-books, not doubting all the while the strict and literal truth of every word in the Bible, he fully accepted the plan, and indeed 'liked the thought of being a country clergyman.'

'Considering how fiercely I have been attacked by the orthodox, it seems ludicrous that I once intended to be a clergyman. Nor was this intention and my father's wish ever formally given up, but died a natural death when, on leaving Cambridge, I joined the *Beagle* as naturalist. If the phrenologists are to be trusted, I was well fitted in one respect to be a clergyman. A few years ago the secretaries of a German psychological society asked me earnestly by letter for a photograph of myself; and some time afterwards I received the proceedings of one of their meetings, in which it seemed that the shape of my head had been the subject of a public discussion, and one of the speakers declared that I had the bump of reverence developed enough for ten priests.'—Vol. i. p. 45.

In consequence of this determination to take Orders he entered Christ's College in the University of Cambridge, first working with a private tutor to recover his school-standard of classical knowledge, which had almost vanished during his two years' residence in Edinburgh.

'During the three years which I spent at Cambridge my time was wasted, as far as the academical studies were concerned, as completely as at Edinburgh and at school. I attempted mathematics, and even went, during the summer of 1828 with a private tutor (a very dull man) to Barmouth, but I got on very slowly. The work

WAS



was repugnant to me, chiefly from my not being able to see any meaning in the early steps in algebra. This impatience was very foolish, and in after years I have deeply regretted that I did not proceed far enough at least to understand something of the great leading principles of mathematics, for men thus endowed seem to have an extra sense. . . . In order to pass the B.A. examination, it was also necessary to get up Paley's "Evidences of Christianity," and his "Moral Philosophy." This was done in a thorough manner, and I am convinced that I could have written out the whole of the "Evidences" with perfect correctness, but not of course in the clear language of Paley. The logic of this book and, as I may add, of his "Natural Theology," gave me as much delight as did Euclid. The careful study of these works, without attempting to learn any part by rote, was the only part of the academical course which, as I then felt and as I still believe, was of the least use to me in the education of my mind. I did not at that time trouble myself about Paley's premises; and taking these on trust I was charmed and convinced by the long line of argumentation.'— Vol. i. pp. 46, 47.

But much more than this came of his career at Cambridge—varied as it was. He had been 'so sickened' with lectures at Edinburgh, that he did not attend Sedgwick's eloquent and interesting courses; but he fortunately enrolled himself—attendance being wholly voluntary—in the class of Henslow, then Professor of Botany, and that Henslow was the making of Darwin, so far as one man can be said to make another, is as clear as noonday.\* Yet he did not study Botany. Henslow, however, had far too wide a range of mind not to have much to offer that to Darwin was acceptable, and the pursuit of entomology—induced by the contagious example of his second cousin, William Darwin Fox, an undergraduate of his own College and standing—was the strongest link that bound these two men together. Still further it is pretty evident, that it was Henslow's influence that saved the young man from the idle if not low company into which (despite his undoubted high principle) he ran a risk of falling; but more than all, it was Henslow to whom is owing the nomination of Darwin as the naturalist of the now famous 'Beagle' voyage—the ultimate results of which, though not appreciated until more than twenty years after it was completed, have already—and their end is not yet—had more effect on the human race than those of any voyage of circumnavigation, the glorious achievement of Magellan not excepted.

After passing his final examination, Darwin had yet to

\* The feeling of these two men for each other was mutual, and Mr. Francis Darwin wisely reprints the passages contributed by his father to Mr. Jenyns's 'Memoir' of Henslow.

reside two terms longer at Cambridge. It requires acquaintance with University life to recognize fully how valuable such a residence may be made by those who know the way to use its advantages. Darwin was evidently one of these men. Through Henslow, who at that time had the habit of keeping open house on one evening in the week to all who were well-affected towards the study of the Natural Sciences, Darwin became acquainted with Whewell, Sedgwick (as before said), Dawes, afterwards Dean of Hereford, Ramsay, the accomplished linguist and tutor of Jesus College—'the finest character I ever knew'—who died soon after, and others of the more enlightened spirits of the University. Of these perhaps the sole survivor is Mr. Blomefield, then known as Leonard Jenyns, by which name he will be always remembered in connection with Zoology and Meteorology, and as the author of the ichthyological portion of the published account of the 'Voyage of the "Beagle."'

'Looking back,' writes Mr. Darwin, 'I infer there must have been something in me a little superior to the common run of youths, otherwise the above-mentioned men, so much older than me and higher in academical position, would never have allowed me to associate with them. Certainly I was not aware of any such superiority, and I remember one of my sporting friends, Turner, who saw me at work with my beetles, saying that I should some day be a Fellow of the Royal Society, and the notion seemed to me preposterous.'—Vol. i. p. 55.

This inference is confirmed by what so acute a judge of capacity as Sir John Macintosh is stated to have said of him, after meeting him some three years before:—'There is something in that young man that interests me,' and Mr. Darwin records that he had heard of the saying, 'with a glow of pride.'

About this time, through reading Humboldt's 'Personal Narrative,' he was seized with a burning desire to visit Tenerife. In April, 1831, he wrote to his relation Fox:—

'At present I talk, think, and dream of a scheme I have almost hatched of going to the Canary Islands. I have long had a wish of seeing tropical scenery and vegetation, and, according to Humboldt, Tenerife is a very pretty specimen.' Again, in May: 'As for my Canary scheme, it is rash of you to ask questions; my other friends most sincerely wish me there, I plague them so with talking about tropical scenery.'—Vol. i. p. 190.

He got information in London, about the best way of making the voyage, passage-money, and so forth, and began to work at

\* As above mentioned, he was also the biographer of his brother-in-law, Henslow.

Spanish,

Spanish, intending to go thither the next year in company with the late Mr. Eyton, of Eyton, then of St. John's College, and afterwards a well-known ornithologist. 'I am sure nothing,' he again wrote, 'will prevent us seeing the Great Dragon Tree.' Tenerife, it is true, he did reach, but under very different circumstances. For fear of his bringing the cholera he was not allowed to land, and therefore never saw the famous tree.

Mr. Darwin's mind being in this condition, it is easy to conceive the effect upon him of the proposal which was suddenly and unexpectedly made to him a few months later, when, after having spent the summer geologizing in Wales with Sedgwick, he was preparing to celebrate the great festival of St. Partridge. This proposal came from Captain Fitz-Roy—afterwards the well-known meteorological Admiral—a most promising officer of the Royal Navy, who, having been appointed to the command of H.M.S. 'Beagle,' on a surveying and possibly a circum-navigatory voyage, was prepared to take on board with him a naturalist as a ship-mate. Though nearly thirty years after, this conscientious gentleman openly expressed his regret at having ever made such an offer; that regret has been shared by few, while the many will always applaud the public spirit he displayed, not only in carrying it out, but also in his way of discharging his duty throughout the whole voyage.\*

The offer was made through Peacock, afterwards Dean of Ely, who was asked to recommend a proper person. Peacock's first thought, as he wrote to Henslow, was of Mr. Jenyns; but the clerical duties of that gentleman hindered him from going, and Henslow at once suggested Darwin, to whom he wrote, urging the acceptance of such an opportunity. Darwin, of course, did not want inducement to avail himself of it, but his father, whom he most properly consulted, though not decidedly refusing his leave, gave so strong an opinion against it that the son—with what feelings we may imagine—dutifully declined. However, Dr. Darwin wisely said, that if a man of common-sense advised his son to go, he would not disapprove, and fortunately this man of common-sense was forthcoming in Josiah Wedgwood, a favourite uncle, who wrote to his brother-

---

\* Some of the disadvantageous circumstances under which the voyage was performed, and especially the parsimony of the Admiralty of that period, come out in the letters here printed, and, if not now made known for the first time, are certainly new to us. In proportion as they discredit the authorities at Whitehall, they reflect credit on Fitz-Roy. At his own risk he laid out a large sum of money in the prosecution of his duties, not having been supplied with sufficient means for their performance, and it is shameful to learn that a portion only of this outlay was refunded to him—the remainder was an utter loss. Mr. Darwin (vol. i. p. 257) ascribes the action of the Admiralty to political motives.

in-law a letter, here printed (vol. i. pp. 198, 199), in which each objection was treated and refuted in a most matter-of-fact method. Hereupon the father gave way, and two days after (September 2nd, 1831), Darwin, whose mind, as he afterwards wrote to his sister, 'was like a swinging pendulum,' arrived at Cambridge, eager to see and confer with Henslow. The next day, a Saturday, was spent by the two friends in talking over the project. Then came some hitch in the business—the precise nature of which is not clear. We may, perhaps, suppose that Fitz-Roy, having heard of the first refusal, had opened negotiations in some other quarter; but on the Monday, Darwin was in London, had seen Fitz-Roy, and was again full of hope. Matters, however, had yet to be arranged with the hydrographer, Beaufort. A week later all was practically settled, and Darwin (having in the meanwhile witnessed the 'half-crowning' of King William IV.) and his captain—who, by-the-way, was only a few years his senior in age—were on their way to inspect the ship, their future home for five years, at Plymouth. Another week and Darwin had revisited his family at Shrewsbury, had again conferred with Henslow at Cambridge, and had returned to London, where he was to stay until the ship sailed, the expectation being that she was to be off by the end of the month. Here we read of him and Fitz-Roy driving about in the latter's 'gig' (not of course the row-boat generally associated with the ideal sea-captain), preparing their outfit, and in the choice of it being helped by Yarrell, the well-known zoologist. The few now living, who remember that kindly old gentleman, will fully understand the zeal with which he entered upon the task of obtaining on the best terms the scientific and sporting tackle required by his young friend—with whom shooting was still a passion as strong as ever. At last all was ready—one more visit to his home, and Darwin was down at Devonport: but here one delay after another presented itself, and it was not until the 27th of December that the 'Beagle' actually got away.

Of the voyage little here need be said. Mr. Darwin's admirable description of it has been before the world for nearly fifty years, and has been read and read again by thousands. But his son prints several letters, written at different times in the course of it, which have more than the charm of novelty to recommend them. Differing as they found themselves to do in opinion on some important questions, Fitz-Roy and his passenger on the whole got on well together. There was one decided rupture between them—a very serious matter, considering what an awful person is the captain of a man-of-war in his

his own ship,—but the magnanimity of the commander who did not hesitate to apologize after a few hours' reflection, and the good sense of both, made all straight again, so that on their return the terms of a letter from Darwin to his chief show that the best relations existed between them—a fact corroborated by plenty of other evidence.

The letters written during the voyage expressive of his feelings at the time are extremely interesting, and it is a pity there are so few of them. Nearly six months after his departure, he writes to his cousin, Fox :—

'My mind has been, since leaving England, in a perfect hurricane of delight and astonishment, and to this hour scarcely a minute has passed in idleness. . . . Geology carries the day; it is like the pleasure of gambling. Speculating, on first arriving, what the rocks may be, I often mentally cry out, 3 to 1 tertiary against primitive; but the latter has hitherto won all the bets. . . . My life, when at sea, is so quiet, that to a person who can employ himself, nothing can be pleasanter; the beauty of the sky and brilliancy of the ocean together make a picture. But when on shore, and wandering in the sublime forests, surrounded by views more gorgeous than even Claude ever imagined, I enjoy a delight which none but those who have experienced it can understand. If it is to be done, it must be by studying Humboldt. At our ancient snug breakfasts, at Cambridge, I little thought that the wide Atlantic would ever separate us; but it is a rare privilege that with the body, the feelings and memory are not divided. On the contrary, the pleasantest scenes of my life, many of which have been at Cambridge, rise from the contrast of the present the more vividly in my imagination.'—Vol. i. pp. 233, 234.

And then he goes on to remind his correspondent of some of these. In another letter, written about the same time to Henslow, he expresses himself with misgivings and modesty :—

'One great source of perplexity to me is an utter ignorance whether I note the right facts, and whether they are of sufficient importance to interest others.'—Vol. i. p. 235.

He gives vent to his appreciativeness of the great German traveller in even stronger terms :—

'I formerly admired Humboldt, I now almost adore him; he alone gives any notion of the feelings which are raised in the mind on first entering the Tropics.'—Vol. i. p. 237.

Two years after, from Valparaiso, he writes to Mr. Whitley, a Cambridge friend, who, having already been Senior Wrangler, subsequently became Reader in Natural Philosophy and Honorary Canon of Durham.

'That

'That this voyage must come to a conclusion my reason tells me, otherwise I see no end to it. It is impossible not bitterly to regret the friends and other sources of pleasure one leaves behind in England; in place of it there is much solid enjoyment, some present, but more in anticipation, when the ideas gained during the voyage can be compared to fresh ones. I find in Geology a never-failing interest, as it has been remarked, it creates the same grand ideas respecting this world which Astronomy does for the universe. We have seen much fine scenery; that of the Tropics in its glory and luxuriance exceeds even the language of Humboldt to describe. A Persian writer could alone do justice to it, and if he succeeded he would in England be called the "Grandfather of all liars."'—Vol. i. p. 255.

The varying moods, to which all who undertake long voyages are subject, are faithfully reflected in these letters. Notwithstanding his devotion to scientific research and exploration, it is plain that his affections were most strongly set upon home, and next to home his thoughts were fixed upon the friends he had made and left at Cambridge. 'I saw the other day a vessel sail for England;' he wrote, 'it was quite dangerous to know how easily I might turn deserter.' When actually on the return voyage, his language was still more emphatic. 'I loathe, I abhor the sea and all things which sail on it.' And again to Henslow, from St. Helena:

'We have neither seen, done, nor heard of anything particular for a long time past; and indeed if at present the wonders of another planet could be displayed before us, I believe we should unanimously exclaim, what a consummate plague. . . . Oh, the degree to which I long to be once again living quietly with not one single novel object near me!'—Vol. i. p. 267.

The explanation of all this is that the latter part of the voyage was tedious. After the excitement afforded by the brief survey of the Galapagos, which only lasted six weeks, the run across the Pacific was only broken by a still briefer stay at

---

\* It is pleasant to know that Mr. Darwin's presence in South America is still remembered there. In his 'Journal of Researches' (chap. xii.) mention is made of his stopping at 'the Hacienda de San Isidro, situated at the foot of the Bell Mountain' in Chili. A friend kindly writes to us:—'The house stands there to the present day. Don Fernando Paulsen is the present owner. I frequently used to visit him when collecting insects. Don Fernando has perhaps the finest collection of Chilian *Coleoptera* existing, and takes a great interest in Natural History generally. The first time I stayed there my host conducted me to a room leading off the *patio* on the ground-floor, and, on opening the door, said, "Do you know who once occupied this room?" On my replying in the negative, he said, "That was Darwin's room." I could do no more than raise my hat. The room is always kept as the visitor's room, and the host is very proud that the Hacienda was one of Mr. Darwin's resting-places.'

Tahiti,

Tahiti, and then came New Zealand and Australia. The zoological wonders of New Zealand had not then been made known, and its appearance was not attractive. Had circumstances permitted the naturalist of the 'Beagle' to explore its interior, and to become acquainted with the marvels of its fauna, we may be sure that chapters, even more interesting than those which treat of South America, would have been found in the 'Journal of Researches.' It was the same with the parts of Australia that were visited. To the naturalist, a British Colony of those days could not have been inspiring; but there is a satisfaction in thinking that the great Island-Continent preserves a memorial of this celebrated voyage; and we trust that among all the changes of nomenclature, which the whims of colonists may suggest, nothing will rob the important site of Port Darwin of the name it then received. A ten days' sojourn at Keeling Island was much more productive of immediate results; for in the experience thus gained, was raised that theory of Coral Reefs which first brought Mr. Darwin prominently before the scientific world. The rest of the return voyage was practically a blank.

On his arrival at Falmouth, October 2nd, 1836, his first thought, after home, was for Henslow and Cambridge:—

'My dear Henslow, I do long to see you; you have been the kindest friend to me that ever man possessed,' he wrote to him from Shrewsbury; and on the same day to Fitz-Roy, 'I do assure you I am a very great man at home; the five years' voyage has certainly raised me a hundred per cent. I fear such greatness must experience a fall.'

The disposal of his collections gave him not a little trouble. Lyell (as might be expected) entered in the most good-natured manner into all his plans, but he chiefly took counsel with Henslow, who advised him to go to Cambridge and there sort out his booty, Lyell saying that after London there was no place in England so good. He found that the botanists cared much for specimens, but the zoologists very little. With the latter, indeed, he was out of patience, 'not because they are overworked, but for their mean quarrelsome spirit;' but the former, to judge by what is told of one of the greatest of them,\* were backward in the discharge of their undertakings. All this ended in his taking Henslow's advice, and establishing himself for a time in his old University, where the only evil he found 'was its being too pleasant.' The following spring he removed to London, and began preparations for the publication

---

\* Vol. i. p. 274, note.



of the 'Zoology of the Voyage of the Beagle'—a work that has ever since commanded the respectful attention of naturalists. Though we are told little about the negotiations which secured the appearance of this work, it is clear that they were not easily effected. At last the Treasury sanctioned a grant of 1000*l.* in aid of the publication, chiefly, it would seem, at the instance of Peacock, who was able to persuade the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Spring Rice, afterwards Lord Monteagle) to consent thereto, and it will probably be generally admitted that seldom has a British Administration spent a thousand pounds more wisely. Mr. Darwin's modesty was not overcome even by this. When all was settled he wrote to Henslow:—

'If I live till I am eighty years old I shall not cease to marvel at finding myself an author; in the summer before I started, if any one had told me that I should have been an angel by this time, I should have thought it an equal impossibility. This marvellous transformation is all owing to you.'—Vol. i. p. 288.

Even more wonderful, perhaps, was the fact, that shortly after he accepted (at Whewell's request, it would seem) the Secretaryship of the Geological Society—an office which, as all should know, is no sinecure, and this he held for three years.

It may be thought, perhaps, that we have dwelt at too great a length on this part of Mr. Darwin's career; but it appears to us to be by far the most pregnant portion of his long life, as well as the most interesting. During this period, and immediately out of the experience gained therein, arose all, or nearly all, those ideas which subsequently blossomed and fructified so luxuriantly. The end of this period, too, found him assured in his station as a man of science, and even as a popular author—to use that ill-used phrase in its very best sense. Looking back, as we now can look back, we see that the germ of this, that, or the other doctrine, which he afterwards enunciated and explained, is discernible in the well-known 'Journal of Researches,' even though at the time its potentiality had not been perceived by him, and therefore was still less perceptible to his readers. The remainder of his life was chiefly occupied with work that grew and deployed out of those germs. Of course, as regards actual importance, there is no comparison possible between the rudimentary and scarcely-outlined concepts of the earlier period and the full-grown products of his later days; but the naturalist needs not much knowledge of embryology to feel assured, that in that branch of his science lies a fascination at least as strong as that possessed by any other, even though the unripe structures he examines, and the organs whose  
beginning



beginning he traces, are as yet far from the attainment of their perfect functions. With feelings of this kind then do the biologists of the present day turn to the pages that record the naturalist's voyage round the world.

His pocket-book for 1837 contains this portentous memorandum:—

'In July opened first note-book on Transmutation of Species. Had been greatly struck from about the month of previous March on character of South American fossils, and species on Galapagos Archipelago. These facts (especially latter) origin of all my views.'  
—Vol. i. p. 276.

The problems thus revolving in his mind did not long wait for a solution, but the solution came most unexpectedly. Some months after the date of the memorandum above quoted, when happening to read for his amusement Malthus's work on 'Population,' it struck him that the theory therein enunciated supplied the very clew of which he was in search; but meanwhile he had been following the example set by Lyell to geologists, and had been collecting on a wholesale scale all the facts which bore in any way upon the subject. Here we may say once for all, that his industry in this as in every other enquiry was continuous and never-tiring. His biographer tells us of his methodical mode of working through every book he read—how that each was marked and indexed, so that the particular fact or statement could be referred to in a moment, whenever occasion required. It may be safely asserted that, had he not adopted some such systematic plan, his later works could hardly have been written, and would never have achieved success. Though his inferences from such or such an assertion have been over and over again disputed, the authority for the assertion itself has seldom been impugned. The great theory, however, which he was subsequently to produce, remained hidden for twenty years, or was only revealed to the most intimate of his friends. One part of it, which he deemed most important, did not indeed dawn upon him until some years later, after his removal to Down; but there was plenty already to fill his thoughts, and in the case of almost any other man we should be surprised to find that, while all these vague notions were fermenting in his mind, he was fully occupied by business of more immediate interest. There were not only the volumes of the Zoology of the 'Beagle' Voyage to be brought out under his Editorial care, and to that treating of the Birds, which was technically done by Gould, he contributed the greater part of what renders it one of the most valuable books in the Ornithologist's library, but there

was the Essay on Coral Islands, before mentioned—about which so much has been written, and about which by no means the last word has been said. But, as if this was not enough, he must go off to Scotland, for a holiday, forsooth! and spend it in attempting a solution of the Glen Roy puzzle. The result appeared in the 'Philosophical Transactions' for 1839; but of it he afterwards wrote that it 'was a great failure, and I am ashamed of it.'

In the January of the year last named he married his cousin, Miss Emma Wedgwood, the grand-daughter of the founder of Etruria, the lady whose tender devotion to her husband is, from motives which all will respectfully appreciate, hardly told by their son, his biographer. Mr. and Mrs. Darwin continued for a few years living in London, and he characteristically writes 'if one is quiet in London there is nothing like its quietness—there is a grandeur about its smoky fogs, and the dull distant sounds of cabs and coaches; in fact you may perceive I am becoming a thorough-paced Cockney, and I glory in thoughts that I shall be here for the next six months.' But, with all this prospect of rest and happiness, now begins the painful part of the story. He fell into bad health, and this bad health lasted, with scarcely any intermission, until the end of his days. We own it was difficult to look at his robust form, to mark his bright eye and his cheery smile, to hear his hearty laugh, and yet to believe what we were told of those uneasy days and still more distressful nights. But this work, with its extracts from diaries kept at the time, proves the truth to have been even worse than was reported in his lifetime. No one, says his son,—

'except my mother, knows the full amount of suffering he endured, or the full amount of his wonderful patience. For all the latter years of his life she never left him for a night; and her days were so planned that all his resting hours might be shared with her. She shielded him from every avoidable annoyance, and omitted nothing that might save him trouble, or prevent him becoming overtired, or that might alleviate the many discomforts of his ill-health. I hesitate to speak thus freely of a thing so sacred as the life-long devotion which prompted all this constant and tender care. But it is, I repeat, a principal feature of his life, that for nearly forty years he never knew one day of the health of ordinary men, and that thus his life was one long struggle against the weariness and strain of sickness. And this cannot be told without speaking of the one condition which enabled him to bear the strain and fight out the struggle to the end.'—Vol. i. pp. 159, 160.

If there be one thing more than another that proves his  
loyalty

loyalty to Science, it is his persistent pursuit of what had now become his vocation. True it is that he was, so far as this world's goods go, in easy circumstances. He had not to work for his bread, or even for his modest luxuries. But this is all the more, we think, to his credit. How many men, so far favoured by fortune, would not have been content to lead, if not a comparatively idle life, the life at least of a *dilettante*, satisfied with the excuse that feeble health gave them for abandoning hard labour? Surely most of us can point to examples of this kind among our own acquaintance—men of undeniable capacity, ingenuity, and even perseverance—who on settling themselves down in comfort have disappointed all the hopes to which their earlier promise had given rise. We can only say that we ourselves have known enough to justify a belief in that supplementary doctrine of Evolution as originally propounded—the Doctrine of Degeneration, which some persons find so difficult to harmonize with the principle of the Survival of the Fittest.

As regards the earlier period of Mr. Darwin's residence at Down, whither he retired after his few years of London life, the place which one of his German admirers declared was so remote from the haunts of men as to be only approachable by a mule-track, little information is given. The reason is obvious. It was a period of quiet, regular work—varied only by depressing attacks of illness, which often wholly prostrated him, or by absences of short duration. His diary indeed shows that he was away from home but sixty weeks in twelve years—the longest of these absences being spent at Malvern or some other place where was a 'Water-Cure' establishment, while much of the remaining time was lost through sickness. More than this his biographer had not been born, or was of an age too young to exercise his faculties. Hence he was left chiefly to the 'Letters' to judge how the time was passed. We say chiefly, because the incessant application to work told at last, and undoubtedly of all Mr. Darwin's work that which he underwent to bring out his several volumes of 'Cirripedes' was the most laborious, and, for the time it lasted, the most irksome. Yet while its value to zoology at large has been most justly reckoned great, its value to him as training was beyond all price. No naturalist ever sat down to monograph a group of plants or animals conscientiously without being the better for it, be the group never so small or unimportant. But here was a large group of animals as diverse in their appearance, as in their structure or in their habits, some of these habits having a direct effect on human affairs, animals too that had never before

been subjected to minute examination, and animals too, as it turned out, that possessed many properties of a nature more extraordinary than it had entered into the mind of the wildest zoologist to conceive.

From what Mr. Darwin says, it is clear that at first he had no intention of making this exhaustive study, and still less any notion of the rich reward that it would bring. On the coast of Chili he had found a curious form of barnacle, which differed so much from all others, that when he came to describe it he had to form a new sub-order for its reception. This led him to take up the whole group of kindred animals, and he was not the man to shrink from the extraordinary toil of 'species-mongering' which proved to be in itself an education. Close work with the scalpel and microscope, coming after the practical training of observation which his voyage had given him, was of course just the reverse of the process that is now recommended to young naturalists, but on him its good effect cannot be questioned, and without it he would certainly have never been what he was. It is not surprising, however, that he was 'wonderfully tired' when all was over, and he wrote in 1852 to Mr. Fox—'I hate a barnacle as no man ever did before, not even a sailor in a slow-sailing ship.' Two years later he told Sir Joseph Hooker, that it was 'in a wearisome manner' that he was engaged in 'sending ten thousand barnacles out of the house all over the world.' All this toil notwithstanding, he had meanwhile never let slip the ideas that came into his head in 1837, and the very next sentence of the letter from which we have just quoted is, 'I shall now in a day or two begin to look over my old notes on species.'

These 'old notes,' however, had already been cast into a connected form, and a provisional theory founded upon the results that they seemed to furnish.

'In June 1842,' as he tells us in his Autobiography, 'I first allowed myself the satisfaction of writing a very brief abstract of my theory in pencil in thirty-five pages; and this was enlarged during the summer of 1844 into one of 230 pages, which I had fairly copied out and still possess.'

One who has had the privilege of reading this transcript rose from its perusal with the feeling of astonishment that, after the amount of thought and labour bestowed on its execution, Mr. Darwin should have ever had strength of mind to set it aside, and to recast its materials into the form in which they eventually came before the public. Nothing more admirably shows the indomitable energy of the man than that he should throw over a  
work

work which, even though not written for publication, but only with the idea of putting his ideas on paper, had already cost so much time, permitting (and that on a special occasion) merely one extract from it to be printed, and then sit down to compose the whole afresh. Yet the reason for taking this heroic step is now explained, for he says:—

‘At that time I overlooked one problem of great importance; and it is astonishing to me, except on the principle of Columbus and his egg, how I could have overlooked it and its solution. . . . I can remember the very spot in the road, whilst in my carriage, when to my joy the solution occurred to me; and this was long after I had come to Down.’—Vol. i. p. 84.

What the solution was need not here be stated. Its validity has been controverted, and we have already declared that we do not mean to enter upon controversial matters. Still, in Mr. Darwin's eyes, this manuscript of 1844 \* seemed to be of immense value, and he accordingly made careful provision for its publication in case of his premature death. The letter to his wife † on this matter is most interesting. He left 400*l.* and any profits of the work as remuneration, and proceeded to name in order those to whose editorial care it was to be offered. Lyell heads the list, then Edward Forbes—‘the next best (and quite best in many respects) would be Professor Henslow. Dr. Hooker would be *very* good. The next, Mr. Strickland.’ Then follows a sentence, erased but still legible, ‘Professor Owen would be very good; but I presume he would not undertake such a work,’ as well as a memorandum, which may be of later date—‘Lyell, especially with the aid of Hooker (and if any good zoological aid), would be best of all.’ Finally, in another place he wrote, ‘Hooker by far best man to edit my species volume. August, 1854.’ ‡

For the next dozen years and more, he continued at the subject with industry unabated and ingenuity unsurpassed. ‘It's dogged as does it,’ was the homely proverb ever in his mouth, and his wretched health seems to have been the only thing that interrupted his experiments, whether they were on the vitality and floating-capacity of seeds, the crossing of breeds of pigeons, or any other kind of investigation which his fertile imagination suggested as possibly bearing on the questions at issue. But even ill-health does not seem to have materially affected the constancy with which his thoughts dwelt on the

\* An outline of its contents is given, vol. ii. pp. 12-14.

† Vol. ii. pp. 16-18.

‡ It may be mentioned that at this time Sir Joseph Hooker, intimate as he was with Mr. Darwin, had not acquiesced in his views.

subject.

subject. This is shown by the letters written during this period—letters which are almost the sole evidence of the way in which his time was employed. Of them a very considerable number are printed here, but most readers will regret that there are not even more. His chief correspondents at this time were his cousin Mr. Fox, Lyell, for whom he had conceived a veneration equal to that he already entertained for Henslow, Sir Joseph Hooker, who, if not already, was shortly to be his most trusted friend, and Professor Asa Gray.\* The characteristic of these letters is the marvellous modesty of the writer, and his unceasing search for more information. They are invariably written in the easiest of styles, and must rather confound those people who imagine that scientific men never get off their stilts. Here is a specimen, taken almost at random, to Mr. Fox :—

‘You will hate the very sight of my hand-writing; but after this time I promise I will ask for nothing more, at least for a long time. As you live on sandy soil, have you lizards at all common? If you have, should you think it too ridiculous to offer a reward for me for lizard’s eggs to the boys in your school; a shilling for every half-dozen, or more if rare, till you get two or three dozen and send them to me? If snake’s eggs were brought in mistake it would be very well, for I want such also; and we have neither lizards nor snakes about here. My object is to see whether such eggs will float on sea-water, and whether they will keep alive thus floating for a month or two in my cellar. I am trying experiments on transportation of all organic beings that I can; and lizards are found on every island, and therefore I am very anxious to see whether their eggs stand sea water. Of course this note need not be answered, without, by a strange and favourable chance, you can some day answer it with the eggs. Your most troublesome friend,

‘C. DARWIN.’—Vol. ii. p. 53.

Here is another to Sir Joseph Hooker :—

‘You have been a very good man to exhale some of your satisfaction in writing two notes to me; you could not have taken a better line, in my opinion; but as for showing your satisfaction in confounding my experiments, I assure you I am quite enough confounded—those horrid seeds, which, as you truly observe, if they sink they won’t float.

‘I have written to Scoresby and have had a rather dry answer, but very much to the purpose, and giving me no hopes of any law unknown to me which might arrest their everlasting descent into the deepest depths of the ocean. By the way it was very odd, but I talked to Col. Sabine for half an hour on the subject, and could not

\* We cannot mention the name of this estimable naturalist without expressing our regret at the event which, since the above was written, threatens to deprive the world of his services.

make him see with respect to transportal the difficulty of the sinking question! The bore is, if the confounded seeds will sink, I have been taking all this trouble in salting the ungrateful rascals for nothing.

'Everything has been going wrong with me lately; the fish at the Zoolog. Soc. ate up lots of soaked seeds, and in imagination they had in my mind been swallowed, fish and all, by a heron, had been carried a hundred miles, been voided on the banks of some other lake and germinated splendidly, when lo and behold, the fish ejected vehemently, and with disgust equal to my own, *all* the seeds from their mouths.\*

'But I am not going to give up floating yet. . . . If you have several of the Loffoden seeds,† do soak some in tepid water, and get [them] planted with the utmost care: this is an experiment after my own heart, with chances 1000 to 1 against its success.'—Vol. ii. pp. 55–57.

The 'Pigeon-fancy' letters seem to have been too technical for publication, since none are printed; but Mr. Francis Darwin says that his father was constantly applying to the well-known Mr. Tegetmeier for advice, and it is obvious that the interesting investigations (whose results are duly recorded in more than one of Mr. Darwin's works, and especially in that on 'Animals and Plants under Domestication') were followed up with the most ardent zeal, and fellow-feeling for the 'fancier,' though his immediate object in crossing the various breeds was to frustrate all that the fancier had been doing from time immemorial. Yet he was so much master of himself that he could well afford to make fun of it; and, in writing to Professor Huxley, after quoting a passage from Mr. Eaton's classical work on the 'Almond Tumbler,' he remarks that 'In short it is almost beyond the human intellect to attend to *all* the excellencies of the Almond Tumbler!'—a passage that may remind our readers of the exclamation of Rasselas to Imlac—'Enough! thou hast convinced me that no human being can ever be a poet.'

His work was making good progress in the early part of 1858. He had freely communicated most of his ideas to Lyell, Professor Asa Gray, and Sir Joseph Hooker—not that any one of them at that time accepted his views—when an event unexpectedly occurred which changed the whole aspect of affairs. Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace, who had already in the valley of the Amazons earned the character of being one of the most observant and thoughtful of travelling naturalists, proceeded in

\* We are told, however, that "the experiment ultimately succeeded," and he wrote to Sir J. Hooker:—"I find fish will greedily eat seeds of aquatic grasses, and that millet-seed, put into fish and given to a stork and then voided, will germinate."

† Tropical seeds washed on the shore of the islands off the coast of Norway.



1854 to investigate the little-known zoology of the Malay Archipelago. A paper of his, published in 'The Annals and Magazine of Natural History' for September 1855,\* had particularly struck Lyell and the late Mr. Edward Blyth (at that time in charge of the Calcutta Museum), each of whom had recommended it to Mr. Darwin's attention. This led to a correspondence with Mr. Wallace, and a letter from the latter, received by Mr. Darwin on the 18th of June, 1858, contained the astounding news that the theory he had been elaborating during twenty years had been suddenly arrived at by Mr. Wallace while in the East.† This letter the writer asked Mr. Darwin to forward to Lyell, and he forwarded it accordingly with most characteristic remarks:—

'Your words have come true with a vengeance—that I should be forestalled.‡ You said this when I explained to you here very briefly my views of 'Natural Selection' depending on the struggle for existence. I never saw a more striking coincidence; if Wallace had my MS. sketch written out in 1842, he could not have made a better short abstract! Even his terms now stand as heads of my chapters. Please return me the MS., which he does not say he wishes me to publish, but I shall, of course, at once write and offer to send to any journal. So all my originality, whatever it may amount to, will be smashed, though my book, if it will ever have any value, will not be deteriorated; as all the labour consists in the application of the theory.

'I hope you will approve of Wallace's sketch, that I may tell him what you say.'—Vol. ii. pp. 116, 117.

Anything more creditable than Mr. Darwin's conduct at this conjunction cannot be conceived. Suffering under domestic affliction—the loss of a child from scarlet fever—he wrote letters

\* It was reprinted among the collected Essays published by him in 1870, under the title of 'Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection.'

† We are violating no confidence when we state, from a letter Mr. Wallace has recently written to a friend, the following facts which we believe have not before been published:—'The most interesting coincidence in the matter, I think, is that I, as well as Darwin, was led to the theory itself through Malthus. In my case it was his elaborate account of the action of "preventive checks" in keeping down the population of savage races to a tolerably fixed but scanty number. This had strongly impressed me, and it suddenly flashed upon me that all animals are necessarily thus kept down—the "struggle for existence"—while variation of which I was always thinking, must sometimes be beneficial, in which case the beneficial variations would increase, while the injurious variations diminished. . . . I was lying on my bed in the hot fit of intermittent fever, when the idea suddenly came to me. I thought it almost all out before the fit was over, and the moment I got up began to write it down, and I believe, finished the first draft the next day.'

‡ Edward Forbes had on a former occasion forestalled the publication of 'the explanation by means of the glacial period, of the presence of the same species of plants, and of some few animals on distant mountain summits and in the arctic regions.' This fact is, we believe, first told in the present work (vol. i. p. 88).

within



within the next few days to Lyell and Sir Joseph Hooker that would do honour to any man. In not one of them is there a trace of jealousy, except for Mr. Wallace's reputation!

'I should be extremely glad,' he wrote to Lyell, after a week's reflection, 'now to publish a sketch of my general views in about a dozen pages or so; but I cannot persuade myself that I can do so honourably. Wallace says nothing about publication, and I enclose his letter. But as I had not intended to publish any sketch, can I do so honourably, because Wallace has sent me an outline of his doctrine? I would far rather burn my whole book, than that he or any other man should think that I had behaved in a paltry spirit.'—Vol. ii. p. 117.

All the world knows the sequel. By the advice of these two true friends, Sir Charles Lyell and Sir Joseph Hooker, the versions of the independent discoverers were simultaneously communicated to the Linnean Society of London on the 1st of July, 1858—within a fortnight of Mr. Darwin's receipt of Mr. Wallace's letter. The reply to that letter is not printed, but we can judge of its tenor, and of the answer it evoked, from what Mr. Darwin wrote not only to Sir Joseph Hooker at this time, but to Mr. Wallace a few months later.\* The whole correspondence on this matter, imperfectly as it is given to us, does the highest honour to all who are engaged in it, and to no one more than to Mr. Wallace who, so far from smarting under the disappointment of finding that he had been anticipated by Mr. Darwin, has always expressed himself glad that so it was, since the love of work, experiment, and detail, which was so pre-eminent in Mr. Darwin's character, gave his treatment of the discovery a force which would have been impossible for the younger discoverer to have wielded.

Undoubtedly these views fell flat on publication, and it is commonly said, and was by Mr. Darwin believed, that but one comment was thereby excited. This, however, is an error, for, in contravention to the unfavourable criticism passed upon them by Professor Houghton, in an address to the Geological Society of Dublin, on the 9th of February, 1859,† they received within little more than a twelvemonth the approval of a naturalist who has since risen to no small distinction as Canon Tristram. This gentleman in a then lately-established journal of limited circulation, but one that has long been recognized everywhere as taking the lead in ornithology—'The Ibis,' to wit—published in the number for October, 1859,† some para-

\* Vol. ii. p. 145.

† Not 1858, as stated in a foot-note (vol. ii. p. 157).

graphs which are worthy of reproduction. Therein (pp. 429, *et seqq.*) he says:—‘Writing with a series of about one hundred Larks of various species from the Sahara before me, I cannot help feeling convinced of the truth of the views set forth by Messrs. Darwin and Wallace in their communication to the Linnean Society,’ and then he proceeds to show how the desert forms of Larks and Chats may have been evolved on the principle of ‘Natural Selection.’ The Canon, it is true, restricted his approval to cases of this kind, and is believed to have subsequently rejected the further application of the principle; but the fact is indisputable that, so far as is at present apparent, he was the first publicly to recognize that the now well-known theory would account for the existence of a remarkable state of things which no one had before attempted to explain. That fact is a matter of history, and be it remembered that this approval, however moderate, was uttered before the appearance of the celebrated ‘Origin of Species.’ It would be foreign to our purpose, as already declared, to follow the matter further; and we adhere to our resolution, as hinted at the beginning of this article, of not saying a word as to the controversies which ensued soon after on the publication of that work. Professor Huxley contributes to Mr. Francis Darwin’s second volume a chapter—clear, concise, and capacious, as is everything that he writes—‘On the Reception of the “Origin of Species;”’ and thence readers of the present generation, to whom what happened nearly thirty years ago is a matter of ancient history, may gather a good notion of what passed in connection therewith, making due allowance, if they so please, for the ‘personal equation’ of the writer. Mr. Darwin, in his ‘Autobiography,’ combats the belief, sometimes asserted, that Evolution was ‘in the air’ (vol. i. p. 87); but we think that he did not recognize the help he received from the writings of the late Professor Louis Agassiz, and especially the effect of the essay contributed a few years before by that highly-esteemed naturalist to Nott and Gliddon’s ‘Types of Mankind.’ It is true that the work just mentioned was not widely-known in Europe, but almost wherever it was read it excited a feeling of despairing astonishment that one who had so often shown such remarkably philosophical characteristics could have carried his views upon ‘Centres of Creation’ to the very pitch of absurdity; \* and his

\* Of course it is now well known that influences, social, political, and religious, of extraordinary force, were brought to bear upon the late Professor Agassiz in the country of his adoption. Few men would have been able to resist such pressure, and we have far too high an opinion of his character to intend it as a reproach when we say that he was not one of those men.

readers,

readers, recoiling from the results of his ratiocination, were ready to adopt almost any adverse doctrine that was taught to them. Mr. Darwin himself attributed the success of the 'Origin of Species' largely

'to my having long before written two condensed sketches, and to my having finally abstracted a much larger manuscript, which was in itself an abstract. By this means I was enabled to select the more striking facts and conclusions. I had also during many years followed a golden rule, namely, that whenever a published fact, a new observation or thought came across me, which was opposed to my general results, to make a memorandum of it without fail and at once; for I had found by experience that such facts and thoughts were far more apt to escape from the memory than favourable ones. Owing to this habit, very few objections were raised against my views which I had not at least noticed and attempted to answer.'—Vol. i. p. 87.

Of the rest of Mr. Darwin's works there is no need to say anything here. Concerning them the world has already pronounced an opinion, and if that opinion is ever to be modified, the time for its modification is not yet arrived. Nor is there much occasion to comment upon the numerous letters that are printed in the remaining portion of these volumes, though they tell the comparatively uneventful history of his later years. They will be read, however, with deep interest both by those who agree, and by those who disagree, with his views. They show no flighty theorist, but a man, who, after having taken up a theory, tries to test its truth by every means in his power, and is always, as it were, *advocatus diaboli* against his own cause. The concluding sentence of our last quotation is not only true as a matter of fact, but it shows wherein lay Mr. Darwin's peculiar strength, and why it is that his followers, provided that they keep within reasonable limits, are so uncommonly hard to beat. The ordinary objections to his theory were almost uniformly foreseen and guarded against by him. One thing, however, has to be said about the letters, which we think will be admitted on all hands to be excellent reading. They abound in a kind of vivacity and sprightliness, which we can only term boyish. This characteristic is continued to the very last, and when we consider the miserable health and consequent depression of spirits under which their writer was almost uniformly labouring, the contentment, the cheerfulness, the charity they display is hardly, we think, to be surpassed.

This leads us to another theme, upon which we must dwell before concluding. Perhaps the chapter in the whole of the three volumes which will be found most welcome to the public

is

is that in which the Editor gives his 'Reminiscences' of his father's every-day life. For ourselves, and we know we are not alone in the opinion we express, we have read it with the greatest pleasure. In the simplest style, wholly without affectation, and as though he was merely describing the way in which some species of plant or animal lives, Mr. Francis Darwin has drawn a picture that, we think, from its intrinsic literary merits will survive. Seldom indeed has—

‘The tender grace of a day that is dead’

been more effectively placed before a reader than in the chapter to which we are now referring. We have here not only the man ‘in his habit as he lived ;’ but the massive and dignified figure is brought truthfully to the mind’s eye of those who remember it. We hear the click of the iron-shod stick, and we are invited to smile at the innocent little weaknesses in which he indulged. We see his enthronement on a chair with its seat raised so high that strangers on entering the room thought it was intended for a giant, and then were amused to find that, when perched upon it, the effect of the elevation was immediately neutralized by having additional support found for his feet. We are told of his solicitude lest the study-fire should have gone out, which was prompted by the desire for a pinch of snuff, that could be got in the hall as he went to mend the fire—for he would not allow himself a snuff-box by his side as he worked. We can feel for his unhappiness at having unexpectedly, and to no purpose, killed a crossbill with a stone, which was only to be explained by the fact that he should never have thrown at it, but for thinking that he had ceased to have the deadly aim that he once possessed. We are reminded of the old aphorism, that the veriest spendthrift has a miserly corner in his heart, when we read of his parsimony in the matter of paper—whether the blank half of a letter or the unused portion of a candle-lighter; but this, it seems to us, may have been the survival of the habit of an old traveller in uncivilized countries, where prudence forbids that anything should be wasted. In like manner we are pleasantly told of his frequent yielding to temptation as regards the eating of forbidden ‘sweets’; and his anxiety—founded on his own ill-health, which he thought might be hereditary—lest his children should not be strong enough to earn their own living. All these harmless foibles, and more beside, are recorded by Mr. Francis Darwin, but simply with the intention of giving a faithful presentment of the man, and assuredly not with any thought of exposing him to ridicule, for the strong mutual affection of son and father—of father and all his children

we

we may say—is manifest beyond doubt. On the other hand must be set his extraordinary command of temper, his invariable kindness of disposition—in nothing better shown than by the courtesy with which even the most foolish letters addressed to him were answered, and by the consideration he practised towards more serious correspondents by having his replies—specially to the enquiries of foreigners—not only legibly written, but so written that the important sentences should easily catch the recipient's eye. His love of dogs, above mentioned, lasted for his lifetime, but he unfortunately allowed, and when too late deeply lamented the fact, his love of poetry and art to die out. In his Cambridge days he mentions his greatly enjoying the pictures in the Fitzwilliam Museum and the National Gallery; while during his voyage in the 'Beagle' Milton, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, were his delight, to say nothing of Gray, Byron, and Shelley; but latterly he could not even tolerate Shakspear, and paintings gave him little pleasure. With all this he retained a true love of fine music, though he says that his enjoyment of it became dulled by age, so that he could not always recognize a piece that he had before heard, and complained that instead of finding recreation in it, it set him thinking too energetically on what he had just been working. Curiously enough, when combined with this loss of the higher æsthetic interests, he may be said in his latter years to have lived upon a diet of novels. They were read to him almost continuously in the intervals of his severer studies, and in listening to them he found his greatest relaxation. In his judgment of them he will have the sympathy of the wisest novel-readers. A harrowing tale, a series of catastrophes, or a sad conclusion he could not bear. 'I like all if moderately good,' he said, 'and if they do not end unhappily—against which a law ought to be passed.' One most delightful trait in his character is the way in which he allowed himself to be 'chaffed'—if we may be pardoned the use of the schoolboy word—by his children. Their pleasantry we may be sure was kept within due bounds, but it certainly seems as if there were some subjects on which he rather enjoyed being rallied by them. Perhaps there is nothing that better shows his amiability than this.

Of him, however, one thing more has to be said, and this is his steadfast resolution to abstain from controversy. We intentionally say 'stedfast,' because the two instances to the contrary cited by his biographer are but exceptions to prove the rule he followed. This determination of not entering into discussion, he said he owed to the advice of Lyell, and its wisdom

no one can doubt. It arose from 'a feeling partly dictated by instinctive delicacy, and partly by a strong sense of the waste of time, energy and temper thus caused,' as we are assured by Mr. Francis Darwin. For some years the author of 'The Origin of Species' was perhaps the most reviled of living men; but he was conscious that the violence, with which he was attacked, generally varied inversely as the knowledge of the subject possessed by his opponents; and indeed it is without question that some of the greatest of his antagonists were unable to appreciate the several points of his argument, while many of the weakest—and therefore the most virulent—wholly failed to understand what his views were. Yet he answered not the bitter charges brought against him, though his letters, especially those to Sir Joseph Hooker, who, for the last twenty years or more of his life, had become his most trusted correspondent—show how keenly they were felt. It is plain that, if he had abandoned himself to the task of replying to his objectors, the remainder of his life would have been wasted in recrimination; and in no way did he more truly fulfil the philosopher's part than by keeping steadily on the path he had chosen, and by refusing to be led astray to follow this, that, or the other skirmisher who beset his course. But he was always attentive to true criticism, as the various alterations, in successive editions of his several works, prove.

Thus passed a life, the more eventful portions of which we have here attempted to sketch, that notwithstanding so much bodily suffering, must be deemed to have been happily spent. Blest with an equable temper, an affectionate family, and a sufficiency of this world's goods, a man might well be content, and Mr. Darwin was most certainly content. But no doubt additional satisfaction was imparted by the success of the opinions he had propounded, and, in this respect, more fortunate than many another original thinker, lived to see accepted. He had never sought fame, and, though he could hardly be indifferent to that which he acquired, he regarded it rather as an index of the reception of what he believed to be the truth, than as a tribute to his efforts in seeking it. The end came peacefully, and he had already felt that his work was done. Whether the doctrines he taught are destined to stand, or to be superseded by some new revelation, it is not for us to say. For all scientific men he has left an example of earnestness, of self-control, and of honour, which will last for ages. *Quando invenies parem?*

---

- ART. II—1. *The History of Catholic Emancipation.* By W. J. Amherst, S.J. Two volumes. London, 1886.
2. *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland, A.D. 1585–1876.* By W. Maziere Brady. Rome, 1877.
3. *The Religious Houses of the United Kingdom. Compiled from Official Sources.* London, 1887.
4. *The Catholic Directory.* London, 1888.
5. *Converts to Rome.* Compiled by W. Gordon Gorman. London, 1884.
6. *The Spectre of the Vatican; or, The Efforts of Rome in England since the Reformation.* London, n.d.
7. *The Present State of the Church in England.* By Lord Bray. London, 1884.
8. *Our Losses. A Letter to the Very Rev. J. A. Canon Wenham.* By the Rev. G. Bampfield. London, 1887.

FROM a variety of causes, the Roman Catholic body in the United Kingdom has come more prominently into view, alike in its ecclesiastical and its social aspect, during the present reign than at any other previous period since the Reformation. There has also been a steady and notable increase in all its permanent plant, personal and institutional, whether the number of the clergy, of monastic bodies, of the churches and chapels, or of the schools and scholars, be taken as the unit of comparison. Thus, the following table exhibits the increase in England and Wales under five heads, between 1850 and 1888:

|            | Bishops. | Priests. | Religious Houses. | School Children. | Churches. |
|------------|----------|----------|-------------------|------------------|-----------|
| 1850 .. .. | 8        | 826      | 17                | 24,000           | 597       |
| 1888 .. .. | 17       | 2314     | 587               | 280,000          | 1304      |

The Scottish increase has been quite as marked, and there are in that country now 6 Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, 334 priests, and 327 churches, chapels, and stations, together with 46 religious houses. A certain proportion of this increase in the United Kingdom is due to conversions, either spontaneous, as in the case of the two waves of secession from the Church of England in 1844–5 and 1850–1, or the outcome of active proselytism on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy; and as this process is a continuous one, it still produces some results, so that it is a matter of some interest to ascertain their measure and prospects. That the ‘Conversion of England’  
has



has been a cherished dream in the Latin Church, ever since the breach with Rome under Henry VIII., is sufficiently well known, and also that attempts to make it a reality have been renewed from time to time with more or less energy. Further, there has been all along just success enough to keep hope alive, for secession to the Roman Church is not a matter of the present day only, but of recurrent appearance, and even of what may be called prevalence at certain periods, while there has been always a slender stream of converts traceable by careful inquirers. The controlling motive in former times, when converts were numerous, was reaction from Puritan excesses, and it may be incidentally said here, as showing how little that type of opinion serves as a deterrent, that the well-known Dr. Doyle ('J.K.L.') in his third 'Letter on the State of Ireland,' published shortly before the Emancipation Act, alleges himself to receive a yearly average of two hundred converts from the Irish Established Church within the dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin, that is, a district about the area of Kent or Essex. It is to be remembered, moreover, that the converts then not only forfeited important civil rights by their action, but made a marked descent in the social scale.

At no time, however, was the Romeward movement so marked as in the earlier half of the present reign, and the hopes on the one part, as the fears on the other, rose correspondingly high. One main difficulty which had all along checked the advance of Roman proselytism in England, was the necessarily foreign origin or education of the clergy engaged in it. They were out of touch with the nation; they did not understand, and could not make needful allowance for, English thoughts and habits, and thus they could do little more than receive those who sought them voluntarily, and scarcely had the power of initiative in their hands. But with the accession to their ranks of a large body of able and cultured men, trained in the best education procurable in England, and so standing on a much higher intellectual level than the ordinary Roman seminarist, the position was seriously altered; and the measure of success, which was immediately visible, gave some ground for the confident expectations, expressed by foreign Roman Catholic observers and critics of the movement, as to the speedy return of England to the Roman obedience. The High Church school of Anglicans was stunned and reeling after the secession of some of its most eminent members, and the remaining sections did nothing to modify the situation. And while it is true that the panic proved but temporary, there is still disquiet felt in many quarters at the progress of the Roman body in England,



England, nor does the political and social condition of that part of the United Kingdom, where Roman Catholicism is prevalent, tend to allay the alarm.

In a question of this kind, however, *à priori* considerations go for little towards a solution. The inductive and comparative method of inquiry alone can lead to trustworthy conclusions, and it is therefore expedient to apply it here and now. A brief survey of a few salient facts in the history of the Anglo-Roman communion will conveniently begin the process. Its formal separation from the Church of England dates from the Bull of Deposition issued by Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth in 1570. It was placed under the government of an Archpriest from 1598 to 1621. In 1623 a bishop with the title of Vicar-Apostolic was appointed, and this arrangement continued till 1688, with the exception of a total abeyance between 1655 and 1685. In 1688 the single Vicariate was increased to four, for the London, Midland, Northern, and Western districts, to which four more, Eastern, York, Lancaster, and Welsh, were added in 1840, giving way in 1850 to the new territorial hierarchy set up by Pius IX. As to the numbers of clergy and laity at intervals in all this period, a few statistics are available. In 1596 there were 250 Roman Catholic priests ministering in England, increased to 500 in 1608, and again to 780 in 1635. At this later date a report by Panzani, an envoy hither from Rome, gives the number of lay Roman Catholics as 150,000; or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in a population of about four millions and a half. A memorial to Pope Clement IX. in 1669 gives the numbers as 200,000, with 800 priests, and this increase is in a larger ratio than that of the whole population in the same interval. There was a very considerable reduction of numbers after the Revolution of 1688, far larger, indeed, than can be accounted for by reckoning the Jacobite exiles and the time-servers who had merely conformed externally to the royal creed. A Report to the Propaganda in 1746 sets down the lay Roman Catholics in the four districts as 56,635, ministered to by 332 priests, and it is stated that there had been no perceptible change for thirty years. Another report in 1773 shows that the numbers were still stationary; but the flight of French Catholics from the Terror in 1792 and the following years brought a great increase of members, while the exiled clergy did much to abate the traditional prejudice against their class. A report to the Propaganda in 1804 mentions, that there were then 50,000 Roman Catholics in the Northern district, and that the increase in Manchester and Liverpool had been very marked; while yet another report in

1814 from the London district (exclusive of the Channel Islands) gives its numbers as 68,776, with 78 churches and 104 priests; twelve chapels and 31 priests serving in London itself for 49,800 lay folks. The change to the present hierarchical system of a Province, with one Archbishop and twelve (later fourteen) suffragans, is one which had been contemplated from the first, and was under special consideration at Rome from 1840 to 1847, when Letters-Apostolic and briefs creating dioceses and nominating their bishops were actually drawn up, but never published. The disturbances of 1848 delayed fresh proceedings till September 29, 1850, when the Letters-Apostolic were issued, establishing the new hierarchy, and therewith abolishing all peculiar constitutions, privileges, and customs, previously existing amongst English Roman Catholics, thus introducing at a stroke the local Roman Ecclesiastical Law, which had never before been in use in this country.

It is unnecessary to repeat the familiar story of the agitation that ensued, culminating in that Ecclesiastical Titles Act of 1851, which was a dead letter from the first, and was repealed without serious remonstrance twenty years after its enactment. It will suffice to say that, if Pius IX. and his advisers had had tact and practical sagacity enough to have communicated with the English Government beforehand, and given explanations of the real force of the proceeding, and if Cardinal Wiseman had worded his first pastoral, 'from outside the Flaminian Gate at Rome,' in a less turgid fashion, it is probable that as little excitement would have been caused by the advent of the brand-new hierarchy as was shown when Leo XIII. dealt in a like manner with Scotland in 1878, and merely supplied material for a few minor paragraphs in the newspapers. The Scottish public, though not supposed deficient in Protestant feeling, were as unmoved by the act of jurisdiction involved in partitioning their country into dioceses as they are by the maps to be seen hung up at railway stations, wherein the island of Great Britain is treated exclusively as an area containing a certain number of dépôts where the goods of a particular tea-dealing firm are on sale.

But two events of much more importance in their effect upon the Roman Church in England, than the mere reconstruction of its titular status, had taken place between the erection of the eight Vicariates in 1840 and the creation of the ecclesiastical province in 1850. One of these has been already mentioned, the Romeward movement of a powerful section of the Tractarian school; but the other has been yet weightier, namely, the vast Irish immigration caused by the famine and fever of 1846-7.

It

It was this, far more than all other causes united, which gave that impetus to the increase of Roman Catholicism in Great Britain, which has been noticeable during the last forty years. The total diminution of population in Ireland between the census periods of 1841 and 1881 is just over three millions, and considerable numbers have emigrated in the six subsequent years. When those who are known to have gone to the United States, Canada, and Australia, are deducted from the total, some hundreds of thousands are still unaccounted for, but there is no difficulty in tracing them. According to the last census, there were domiciled in Great Britain no fewer than 781,119 persons actually born in Ireland, to whom must be added the children born here of Irish parents (usually married early and notably prolific) ever since 1841, who cannot be fewer than a quarter of a million more. The present ratio of Roman Catholics in Ireland to the rest of the population is 78 per cent., although almost the whole diminution by famine, fever, and emigration, fell upon them exclusively, and but little affected the members of other religious communions; so that we can safely compute not less than 80 per cent. of the Irish element in Great Britain as belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. Adding, then, children born since 1841 of Irish parents in England, we shall get over a million due to this one element, of whom eight hundred thousand at least are Roman Catholics, and probably many thousands more. But the very highest figure, at which any rational calculation puts the Roman Catholics of England and Wales, is a million and a half. Some put it as low as a million, but the number estimated by the 'Catholic Directory' for this year is 1,354,000. The addition of the foreign Roman Catholics from France, Italy, South Germany, &c., resident in Great Britain, to the Irish element, accounts for many thousands of these, and proportionally lessens the purely English factor, which seems to be at most half a million, all told. Two questions then present themselves: How far does it appear that this number is the result of proselytism? Does the ratio show any steady increase in proportion to the whole population?

Very little success was achieved by the Roman missionaries in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., chiefly because of the ably organized spy-system that penetrated the foreign seminaries, which fed the English mission, and tracked their emissaries along every step of their road. With the marriage of Charles I. to a Roman Catholic princess, the way seemed to be opened for a change of policy, and Gregorio Panzani was sent hither in 1634, partly to appease dissensions amongst the

Roman Catholics themselves, and partly to negotiate terms of reunion between England and Rome.

Panzani made no attempt to deal with the project of reconciliation till he had been some considerable time in England, beyond a private communication to the Queen; but in January 1635 he had an interview with Secretary Windebank, who proved friendly to the project, and procured for him an audience of the King, already influenced by Henrietta Maria in his favour, and thus more than courteous in his reception of the envoy. This made Windebank bolder, and Panzani reports the alleged reunion to be thirsted for by all the moderate men in Church and State, saying that if there were neither Jesuits nor Puritans in England it might be effected. Panzani hereupon, and afterwards also, pressed for a decree for liberty of conscience, and for the suspension meanwhile of the penal laws—a circumstance which throws some light on the earlier proceedings of James II. fifty years subsequently. The project which they agreed upon, in concert with the Queen's confessor, was to establish a reciprocal agency between the Court of Rome and the Queen, by means of which cautious experiments towards reunion might be made. Something had been done in the previous year to sketch the outlines of an accommodation, for it was then that Nicolas Davenport, an English Franciscan, published, under his monastic name of Franciscus à Sancta Clara, a treatise entitled '*Deus, Natura, Gratia*,' wherein he minimized the differences between the Thirty-Nine Articles and accredited Roman doctrine in a fashion repeated three centuries later in the more famous '*Tract XC.*' But as the reunion scheme was not sincerely entertained by the Roman Court, which aimed at the submission and subjection of England, not at its alliance on any terms which could imply independent rights, Davenport's treatise, though highly praised at the time by several theological censors, including Jacques Dreux, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, was strongly disapproved alike by the English Roman Catholics themselves and by the authorities at Rome, who censured it, though without making the decree public, and summoned the author to come and clear himself of suspected heresy. This he was far too cautious to do, offering, however, to make satisfaction in any other way, and pleading bodily infirmity as his excuse for disobeying the summons. But the Jesuits were determined not to let the matter rest on this footing, and took care to circulate in England the news of the censure on his book; and though he published an Apology for it, and submitted it and himself to the judgment of the Pope, yet this was not held sufficient, and attempts were made

to

to drive him out of England. The reports, made by Panzani and by the Queen's confessor to Cardinal Barberini, represent the Jesuits as constituting one great obstacle to any reconciliation; while an equal difficulty was the strong Puritan spirit prevalent in the country, and actively manifested in the House of Commons, which made it unsafe for those who sympathized with the idea of reunion to disclose their sentiments, and obliged them even to put the penal laws against Roman Catholics into operation to avert suspicion and peril from themselves. The plan of an agency went so far that the King actually nominated two persons in succession to act for the Queen, who had been selected rather than himself as the chief person to conduct the negotiations, not only by reason of her creed, but because the laws forbad all diplomatic relations with Rome, and it would have been highly dangerous for Charles to violate them. It is unnecessary to pursue the history of this abortive project in detail, but the absolute impossibility of any result coming of it, short of unconditional submission on the English part, appears plainly from the instructions sent to Panzani after he had reported a conference he had held with Montague, Bishop of Chichester, one of the chief sympathizers with reunion projects. He is directed to avoid particular controversies, and not to specify terms of communion, but to keep to generalities, and to call on the Anglican bishops and clergy to examine the motives which had led to the breach with Rome, and as they must find that these were human and unwarrantable, it would then be their duty to come forward and sue for a reconciliation. When they had done so, a Court of Judicature might be established to pronounce upon particular points; while the Pope would make no unreasonable demands, but merely claim the essentials of his Primacy, and those privileges annexed thereto *jure divino*. It was useless to discuss particular points of controversy, not only because such debates had hitherto led to no results, but because 'it was never the custom of the Catholic Church to admit of such kinds of disputes till the fundamental point of a supreme judge was first settled, for then other matters would come in of course.' That is to say, the only view of a reconciliation admitted at Rome was that the English Church should first confess itself to have been entirely in the wrong, acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope as of divine right, and then throw itself on his mercy to prescribe such terms to it as he pleased.

Many individual secessions to Rome took place about this time, a few of which may be ascribed to the influence of the Queen and her chaplains, and some more to the labours of the missionary

missionary Roman clergy; but by far the largest number must be attributed to reaction from the violent excesses of the Puritans in Church and State, and to the seeming failure of the counter-movement, of which Laud was the originator and head. Of course this temper of despondency was much stimulated by the further progress of events, culminating, so far as the Church of England was concerned, in the judicial murder of her Primate, the penal prohibition of her liturgy, the overthrow of her polity, and the deprivation of more than seven thousand of her beneficed clergy.\* This seemed to teach waverers unmistakably, that the great experiment of Anglicanism, the maintenance of a Church which should be Catholic without being Papal, had miserably failed after a century's trial, and that there was no practical alternative between the Puritanism, which there was so much reason to detest, and the Roman Catholic system, to which they gave a not surprising preference. After the King's execution, and the flight of English loyalists abroad, the process of conversion was carried on amongst the exiles in France, and the conduct of the authorities of both Church and State there towards the refugee Anglican clergy is in ignoble contrast with the manner in which England more than a century later treated the French clerical exiles. No pains were spared to entice away their flocks, and to make their position untenable, and the converts procured in this fashion had of course some influence in gaining others when they returned to England after the Restoration. The impolicy of James II. effectually stopped this movement, and, as already stated, there was a great diminution in the number of English Roman Catholics during the Revolution era. The spiritual languor of the eighteenth century, that time of exhaustion after the volcanic religious outbursts of the preceding two hundred years, extended to the Roman Church as well as to most other communions; and virtually nothing was done in the matter of active proselytism by the Roman body in England, which did no more than hold its own, save in so far as it was recruited by foreign immigrants. It was the traditional habit of the old hereditary Roman Catholic families to live in seclusion, and to withdraw as much as possible from public notice—a course which was at first dictated by policy, as the best mode of avoiding the incidence of the penal code, but which continued as matter of usage

\* There was no regret felt in Rome at the Puritan triumph, and there was even joy expressed at the death of Laud, in whose policy of re-asserting the historical basis and continuity of the Church of England against the Zuinglo-Calvinism which he found prevalent, far more danger to the Roman claims than from any other quarter was seen to exist.

long after the disuse or repeal of the oppressive statutes had made it superfluous, so that the existence of such a body was all but forgotten by the general public.

The tolerance and sense of justice, which partly lift the eighteenth century above the otherwise low moral estimate, it merits, in preparing the way for the abolition of the penal code, did more to encourage a relatively friendly feeling towards Roman Catholicism than all the arguments of theologians; and the marked disinclination of the time for positive dogma took in most cases the form of overlooking the points in controversy with Rome as virtually obsolete speculations, with no practical bearing whatever. There was more than a touch of contempt in this view of the matter, but it was free from the quality of hatred, and thus opened the way for discussion of the theological as well as the political aspects of the question. Of course it was inevitable that controversy should wake anew, and accordingly we find apologetic and polemical treatises beginning to appear on the Roman Catholic side; the most noteworthy of which are Berington and Kirk's '*The Faith of Catholics confirmed by Scripture, and attested by the Fathers of the First Five Centuries of the Church*,' London, 1813; the '*Letters to a Prebendary*,' London, 1800, and '*The End of Religious Controversy*,' London, 1818, both by Dr. John Milner, Bishop of Castabala *in partibus*, and Vicar Apostolic of the Midland district from 1803 till his death in 1826. Berington and Kirk's book is a moderate, and indeed a minimized, statement of Roman Catholic doctrine, containing matter likely to have led to its being put on the Index, had it first appeared under Pius IX.; while Milner's two books, both able and attesting much reading, are quite untrustworthy and disingenuous. But they did effective work in their day, and assisted in bringing about some of the straggling conversions which then took place; especially as the Anglican clergy, long disused to controversy, were not prepared with prompt and cogent replies to Milner's sophisms and misquotations. To this period also belongs a book written in the Roman Catholic interest and, it was said at the time, for Roman Catholic pay, Cobbett's '*History of the Protestant Reformation*,' London, 1810, a coarse and clever impeachment of that movement, dwelling exclusively on its seamy side, and so producing a mere travesty of history, but that in a telling, incisive fashion, which made it a useful weapon in the hands for which it was forged. Contrariwise, the evidence collected by the Parliamentary Committee appointed to ventilate the question of Roman Catholic Emancipation, and especially that tendered by Bishop Doyle, by its consistent repudiation of Ultramontane



Ultramontane opinions from all sides, tended to allay much of the dislike and distrust with which the measure was regarded, and to convey a far more favourable impression of Roman Catholicism as a working religious system than had previously been current, so that the Roman attack on the Church of England and defence of the Latin Church came simultaneously before the public, and insensibly affected popular feeling.

The actual passage of the Emancipation Act had little visible effect on the Anglo-Roman laity, save that it tended to relax the seclusion in which they had been living; but its indirect effects were of a momentous kind. The change, which the Act brought about in the political condition of Ireland, thrust the question of the Established Church forward as a Roman Catholic grievance, and induced politicians there to devise means of satisfying the complainants without arousing a more formidable counter-agitation in England. And one measure framed for this end was the Irish Church Temporalities Act, 3 and 4 William IV. c. 37, a voluminous statute of 167 sections, whose main provisions were the suppression of two archbishoprics and ten bishoprics, with a wholesale redistribution of ecclesiastical revenues. This statute was the immediately proximate cause of the Tractarian movement, destined to change the whole face of the Church of England, and to communicate a new energy to Anglo-Romanism also. In the earlier stages of this Oxford movement, the line taken up by its leaders, partly through the influence of the late Sir William Palmer, incomparably the best scientific theologian amongst them, was virtually that of the greater Stewart divines, and definitely non-Roman. But as time went on, this temper changed in the case of many, not only because further study convinced them that much of the traditional polemic against Romanism was distorted and indefensible, but because the suspicion and hostility aroused against themselves for innovating upon the prevalent forms of religious opinion, and rather encouraged than checked by those in authority, persuaded them that their choice lay between voluntary secession from the Church of England and involuntary extrusion from it; and, above all, because they were keenly alive to the faults and shortcomings of the system with which they were familiar, and especially outraged by the Gorham Judgment of 1850, which they thought committed the Church. And they were not at all aware of defects in the Roman Church, so as to be able to compare them, and especially to discover what amongst the evils on either part are accidental and remediable, and what are integral portions of the system itself, and thus practically without remedy. Thus there were, besides single conversions

to

to the Roman Church from time to time, two great tides of secession which carried away many clergymen of ability and position, not a few of whom took orders in the Church of Rome, and became active in proselytizing for their new communion. The names of Cardinals Newman and Manning, Frederick Oakeley, William Dodsworth, Frederick William Faber, Edward Caswall, William Maskell, Robert Isaac Wilberforce, William Palmer of Magdalen, Thomas Harper, William George Ward, and Thomas William Allies, will at once occur to those whose memory keeps record of the movement; and there were several of less note, but of more than respectable abilities, and influential in their spheres, who took the same step, followed by not a few laymen of scarcely inferior mark. There is no doubt that the accession of these recruits to the Roman cause had much to do with the setting up of the new Anglo-Roman hierarchy in 1850; and as from almost exactly that time the policy of the Roman Catholic authorities in this country was changed from the passive and quiescent attitude, adopted from the Revolution onwards, into a militant and aggressive demonstration against the Church of England, the popular phrase of the time, 'Papal Aggression,' did after all roughly, but not unfairly, describe the fact. From 1850, then, the Anglo-Roman Church entered on a new phase of its existence, reviving, under changed conditions, and with much diminished risks, the polemical efforts of Elizabeth's and James I.'s days.

What, then, has been the course of its action during the subsequent period, and what degree of success can it claim to have achieved so far, or reasonably look forward to as yet in the future? From what has been already said as to the earlier fortunes of the Roman mission in England since the breach of communion, it appears that the foreign-bred missionaries have never even seemed to succeed in making any impression on the nation at large, however acceptably they might minister to their co-religionists. Any success that is discernible must be attributed indivisibly to men who had been educated in English schools and Universities, and who had also been, for the most part, members of the reformed Church of England. Further, only the merest fraction of the clerical and other educated converts during the period 1843-1851 was obtained by Roman proselytism; nearly the whole number consisting of such as had worked out the problem themselves first, and then, either by using with others the arguments which had convinced themselves, or by the mere force of their personal influence, induced them to copy their example.

An inquiry, then, into the later fortunes of the Anglo-Roman communion

communion is, for all practical purposes, an inquiry into the annals of the convert element only, whose intellectual preponderance amongst their co-religionists is sufficiently attested to the outer public by the fact, that the two Roman dignitaries of highest rank in England at this moment are both of them converts.

The questions, then, which present themselves for solution are these :

1. How far did the convert movement deplete the Church of England's energy, by draining it of eminent clergymen and laymen ?

2. Has this draining process been sustained in the period since 1851, notably in respect of the mental powers and acquirements of the converts ?

3. Has the energy withdrawn from the Church of England been effectively transferred to the Church of Rome, and specially in such a manner as the creation of an Anglo-Roman literature, capable of holding its own in comparison with the Church of England literature, and in removing the note of want of culture ?

4. What is the actual progress made by the Roman Church in the nation at large ?

With regard to the first of these questions, the number and importance of the secessions have been largely exaggerated by tradition, misapprehension, and the absence of detailed information. And this mistake was worked assiduously by proselytizers, who utilized it for the purpose of creating an impression of their extraordinary successes amongst the educated classes, and thereby persuading unwary persons to follow so wide-set an example. But the capital mistake of abandoning generalities for particulars was made about ten years ago in the 'Whitehall Review,' which published week by week for some time a list of 'Rome's Recruits' amongst the clergy and educated laity since the beginning of the Oxford movement. This was reprinted in an enlarged form in 1884, with the new title of 'Converts to Rome: a List of over three thousand Protestants who have become Roman Catholics since the Commencement of the Nineteenth Century.' But as in this later shape it scours all over the world, and embraces Russians, Germans, and Americans in its survey, besides dealing with forty years before the first Oxonian secession, it is less useful for the present purpose than the original lists, which were confined to England, Scotland, and Ireland, and mainly, though not exclusively, to Anglicans. It will suffice, therefore, to quote from them, merely supplementing them with a few figures from the later issue.

It should be premised that whatever errors, accidental or otherwise,

otherwise, may be detected in these lists, they are entirely free from under-statement. There are names inserted which have no business there, and some names of little children are set down as though they were adults; but no name has been left out that could be got hold of, and the humblest claim to social position, such as kinship to an attorney, has been held sufficient for admission to the honours of the list.

The total enumerated in 1878 was 335 clergymen, 765 laymen, and 716 ladies. Since that time some ten or a dozen more clergymen have seceded, and perhaps as many layfolks as will bring the total of clergy and laity up to 1900, about as many as could be got into the one church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields; while, from another basis of calculation, the clergy are about six months' supply, three hundred and fifty being about the average number ordained in half of each year, and are considerably less than one per cent. of the whole English clergy during the time covered. Comparing this total of 1900 with the 2671 Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in Great Britain, without taking account of the many hundred members of Roman Catholic religious orders, also engaged directly or indirectly in the work of proselytism, the results are disproportionately small, yielding only a fraction of a convert to each of their Eminences, Graces, Lordships, and reverences during fifty-four years of unceasing effort.

If we look, however, to the personal equations of the seceders, the survey is more flattering to the Roman cause, yet far less so than has been often supposed. The most distinguished of the clerical converts have been named already, and there are but few to put even approximately near them. Dr. Northcote, Mr. H. N. Oxenham, Mr. J. B. Morris, Mr. H. J. Coleridge, Mr. William H. Anderdon, Provost Fortescue, Mr. Joseph Stevenson, and Mr. J. B. Dalgairns, pretty nearly exhaust the record. Of notable laymen, law gives Mr. James R. Hope Scott, a grandson of Sir Walter Scott, Sir George Bowyer, Mr. Badeley, and Serjeant Bellasis; science contributes Professors Pepper and Barff; art, Augustus Welby Pugin and Mr. J. R. Herbert; scholarship, Mr. F. A. Paley and Mr. Le Page Renouf; diplomacy, Lord Lyons (?); politics, Lord Ripon, Lord Emly, and Matthew Higgins ('Jacob Omnium'); literature, Mr. Aubrey de Vere, Mr. Coventry Patmore, Mr. Kenelm H. Digby, Mr. James Oxenford, and Mr. James Grant. The entire number of convert names, which a well-informed man of middle age would recognize without effort, as being of some mark before or after their secession, is only about sixty, while of even them Cardinal Newman alone stands in the very first rank, and by far

far the greater number achieved no more than a *succès d'estime*. Without at all seeking to depreciate the merits which may justly be attributed to them, or to dispute the loss of confidence, of prestige, and of immediately available power, which befel the Church of England by reason of their change of allegiance, the facts remain, that the blow was rather alarming than seriously dangerous; that the recovery from it was speedy and thorough, as evidenced by the continuous process of revivification and bracing which has been going on uninterruptedly for the last thirty-six years in every part of the Church of England; and that, so far as the withdrawal of the seceders can be held to point a moral against the Church of England, the charge can be crushingly retorted by reference to the eminent men driven out of the Church of Rome by the Vatican Council, collectively far more numerous and individually more distinguished, even Cardinal Newman himself not more than equalling Dr. Von Döllinger in mental power, and not so much as approaching him in theological and general erudition. There is one very curious fact in connexion with the clerical seceders, which has received less attention than it deserves: that no Biblical scholar—that is to say, no one whose speciality was the critical or exegetical study of Scripture, or who has contributed anything of value to expositions and commentaries on any of its books—is reckoned amongst them.

The second inquiry results in finding that, instead of the secessionist movement acquiring additional momentum with the progress of time, it suddenly and steadily slackened, and has never shown any tendency towards recovery. Many of the earlier and more important secessions exemplified the old fable of the ewe, which warned her lamb against the leopard, describing it as a beast of the most hideous aspect, and the lamb, quite unable to recognise the portrait in the beautiful creature it saw a little later, went confidently up to it, and was instantly slain and devoured. The converts had been reared in a No-Popery tradition of the most raw-head and bloody-bones character; they had been taught that there was nothing good in Rome, and that it was scarcely possible to differ too completely from it; so, when they gradually found out what a dissimilar way there is of viewing the facts, when they learnt something of the ascetic, the charitable, the devotional, the missionary, the literary, aspects of Roman Catholicism on its nobler side, it is little wonder that they made haste to abandon their old prejudices, and took for granted that every charge against the mighty Latin Church was as baseless as those whose untenability they had ascertained. Their attitude, accordingly,  
towards

towards their old associates recalls the speech of Moses to Hobab: 'Come thou with us, and we will do thee good.' It might well have been expected that, when they had completed their journey, and had changed their language into that of Joseph to his father and brothers, inviting their friends to come into the plenty and prosperity of Egypt out of the famine and misery of Canaan, a still greater number would listen and comply, that increased familiarity with Roman Catholicism would develop and make permanent that attractive power which it had exercised upon themselves on their first discovery of its merits. But the fact has not been so, and few things are more noticeable and less disputable than the deterioration of quality amongst the converts for thirty years past, as compared with their precursors. It is speaking well within bounds to say, that not five have seceded in that time whose departure produced so much as a ripple on the surface; and the Vatican decrees of 1870, by raising a plain and distinct issue which every man competent to form an intelligent opinion on the matter knows to be absolutely incapable of honest defence, have further lowered the standard, so that none but intellectual or moral cripples have given in their submission since, as little gain to the Church of Rome as loss to the Church of England. If the Jesuits had not been in such a hurry to get the Vatican decrees passed in 1870, but had waited a few years, it is quite conceivable that the stampede, which followed upon the Gorham Judgment, might have been repeated on a far larger scale under the still more serious provocation of the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, intended to enforce the Privy Council findings in the Mackonochie and Purchas cases, and to drive the advanced High Church school out of the Church of England. In point of fact, the Roman Catholic ratio of population here rose markedly just then, and indicates what might have occurred, if the door had not been shut and barred by the Infallibility dogma.

As to the influence exerted by the convert element upon Anglo-Romanism, the results are scarcely what might have been looked for. The old school of Roman Catholic clergy, largely trained in France, had no little of Gallican independence, and symbolized with Bossuet rather than with Bellarmine. They had no width of culture, though they had a sprinkling of learned men, such as Lingard, Berington, and Milner among them; they were provincialized and often unrefined, but their type of Roman Catholicism was in the main moderate, robust, and manly, free from sentimentality and hysterics, and commendably so from bigotry; so that on the whole, if they did nothing else,

else, they lived on friendly terms with their Anglican neighbours, and taught wholesome morality in an old-fashioned way. What might fairly have been looked for was that the clerical converts, coming from a higher stratum of society, possessed of a wider and more liberal culture, and above all, having necessarily become acquainted with two sides of the questions between Rome and England, while the seminarist clergy have never been permitted to know of more than one, would have simply lifted the whole Anglo-Roman clerical body into a higher atmosphere, would have maintained all that was healthiest and most genuinely English in their teaching and methods, and would have enlarged their range, so as to make them better able to deal, as preachers, as confessors, and as directors, with the more cultivated class which the convert laity, as compared with the hereditary Roman Catholics, represented. In point of fact, little or nothing of this programme was so much as outlined. The majority of the clerical converts, bowing to the usual law of reaction, adopted the extreme Ultramontanism of Italy and of the modern French clergy, rather than the healthier type of German or the elder French Catholicism, and set themselves ardently to Italianize the Anglo-Roman Church in every manner, doctrinal, disciplinary, devotional, and artistic. The head-quarters of this new departure (described by Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans as 'Romanism gone mad') was the Brompton Oratory, under the headship of Frederick William Faber—a graceful poet, but a man of little judgment, learning, or mental balance.\* Cardinal Wiseman, an eminent scholar and an astute controversialist, was not a very active ruler, and did not further this programme so much as might be expected; but when Cardinal Manning was forced upon the Roman clergy of the titular arch-diocese against their will, and in contemptuous disregard of the claims of Archbishop Errington, who had been coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman with right of succession, the Ultramontane movement was pushed on vigorously, and that, in several ways, little to the satisfaction of the native school of Roman Catholics, who have never heartily welcomed either the men or the measures of the imported system. How those in a somewhat humbler rank of society viewed the new departure

\* 'Mais qui donc nous apporte cette nouvelle religion? Ce n'est rien moins qu'un docteur en théologie, prêtre de l'Oratoire de Londres, le pieux et digne P. Faber, dans un discours intitulé: *De la dévotion au Pape*. Chacun peut vérifier. Oui! voilà ce que des aveugles nous apportent comme étant le vrai Christianisme! Je trouve M<sup>re</sup> l'évêque d'Orléans bien doux, lorsqu'il nomme *Romanisme insensé* cette inepte et coupable tendance. C'est l'oubli même du Christianisme. C'est le mépris de l'Evangile et de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ.'—P. Gratry, *Troisième Lettre à M<sup>re</sup> Dechamps*, § VI.



may be told in an anecdote derived from the late Canon Thomas Frederick Simmons, rector of Dalton Holme, near Hull, a part of Yorkshire where there are many old Roman Catholic families settled. The Roman clergy in this district were of an old-fashioned, easy-going type, on the best possible terms with their Anglican neighbours, and willing to accept the hospitality offered to them by their flocks, with whom they mixed freely in social intercourse, making no display of either exclusiveness or asceticism. Under the new regime, this was regarded as 'disedifying,' and a change was resolved upon. Accordingly, on the death of one of the older clergy, a fiery zealot of the last brand-new Italian pattern was sent to fill his place, and began his reforms with all the energy of a new broom. Probably enough, some of the changes he introduced may have been desirable corrections of former laxity, but he proved to be interfering and dictatorial, making demands upon his flock to which they had been quite unaccustomed, and insisting upon their submission to all his directions. Accordingly, they convened a meeting, and drew up a round-robin addressed to the Roman Catholic Bishop, informing him that if he did not remove that 'Puseyite,' and send them a priest more like him they had lost, they would all join the Church (*sic*).

It might have been thought that Cardinal Newman, who has recorded his dislike of some of the modern hysterical cults, describing them as 'like a bad dream,' and who also once repudiated the loose morality of Liguori (though before Pius IX. gave it the high authoritative sanction involved in proclaiming Liguori a 'Doctor of the Church'), would have done something to check this indiscreet mode of action, but various reasons prevented it. On the one hand, he was in some sense committed to the Italian party, not only by the acerbity of the attacks he made upon the Church he had quitted (in his 'Loss and Gain,' 'Anglican Difficulties,' and other writings of that time and stamp), but by his having attached himself to such a hyper-Italian society as the Oratorians, though the institution he has long governed at Edgbaston has never won the unenviable reputation which clings to its Brompton sister. On the other hand, he was himself treated virtually as a suspect, and kept steadily in the background, during the whole reign of Pius IX., not only because that feeble-minded Pontiff was incapable of appreciating his merits, but because he had active unfriends in positions of influence; and those who are behind the scenes know of an incident affecting him which minutely recalls the story of the Countess of Nottingham and Essex's ring. No protest

protest which he could have made would have been heeded ; and the only probable result would have been some censure upon himself, more or less severe, which he cannot be blamed for declining to invite. But one consequence of the Italianizing movement is, that the Anglo-Roman Church has been once more put as effectively out of touch with the nation as it was when it drew its clergy from foreign seminaries alone, for the mere geographical position of a training-college within the limits of England will not correct the influence of Italian methods in its management, and of an Italian system awaiting its students after their ordination. Apart from such a consideration, a perusal of the roll of Priests of Great Britain in the 'Catholic Directory' shows an enormous percentage of Irish and foreign names, attesting their exotic character. The letter O is of course not a fair one to take as an average example, but none the less it is noticeable that there are only twelve presumably English surnames in the hundred and thirty classed under it. The letter R is a much more favourable one, but of the hundred and sixteen names under it, forty are certainly Irish or foreign, and in all probability almost as many more, whose nationality is not indicated by their forms.

As regards the literary aspect of the matter, there is little activity to be recorded on the part of Anglo-Romans, new or old. Cardinal Newman, in the preface to his 'Discourses on the Idea of a University,' has eloquently apologized for the lack of culture, which he admits and laments as prevalent amongst the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom, saying that 'robbed, oppressed, and thrust aside, they have not been in a condition for centuries to attempt the sort of education which is necessary for the man of the world, the statesman, the landholder, or the opulent gentleman.' There is enough truth in this plea to make harsh criticism of the scanty literature of the older Anglo-Roman body essentially unjust ; rather the high quality of some of it merits exceptional commendation, having regard to the disadvantages under which its authors laboured. But Cardinal Newman might have added another class to his list of those whom Roman Catholics fail to educate adequately, and that is their own clergy. One result of the virtual abandonment of the Universities of Europe as places of education for the clergy of the Latin Church, and the general erection of seminaries for their separate training, according to the decree of the Council of Trent, while effecting one object which the wire-pullers of the Council had in view, that of unifying the whole clerical body both in doctrine and in discipline, so as to make it at once easier to rule and  
better

better able to present an unbroken front to the heterogeneous forces of Protestantism, has been a wholesale lowering and narrowing of clerical education, making it technical and illiberal (in the moral, not the political, sense of the word) to a very high degree, and putting the average Roman Catholic clergyman everywhere, except in Germany, where the Universities of Bonn, Tübingen and Freiburg have to some extent held their ground as schools of Catholic theology, entirely out of touch with the educated laity, thus leading to the wide promotion of passive or active unbelief. The English student of theology, who happens to light for the first time upon a Roman Catholic theological text-book, is apt to be struck by its lucid arrangement, and its incisive, unfaltering statements, contrasting not a little with some of the books his own teachers recommend to him. He believes himself to have come upon the adit of an inexhaustible mine, but, as he procures one book after another, he finds that they are all of the same pattern, containing just the same matter a little differently worded, and that the range is limited on all sides in a thoroughly cramping fashion. If he happens to know anything of the older writers, whether of the medieval Church or of the great period of the Gallican Church, he cannot fail to be forcibly struck by the superiority of the earlier literature in variety, breadth, spiritual insight, and all the higher qualities of theology. Here, then, is a field wherein the converts might have done good work, giving their powers to producing a religious literature of a more nutritive and stimulating kind, as well as of a more healthy tendency, than the dry husks or sentimental trash which constitute much of that actually current. But they have neither filled the gap effectively, nor even created a demand by encouraging the love of reading.

A letter in the 'Tablet' of December 28, 1878, alleged, on the information of a leading Roman Catholic publisher, that the Roman Catholic reading public of London consists of no more than six hundred persons; and when the proportion of converts that London contains is taken into account, this seems to denote that they rather lose the taste for reading themselves than succeed in communicating it to others. As regards the actual contributions of more than a fugitive kind made to theology and religious philosophy by converts, the whole vast field of Biblical literature is represented by one unimportant edition of the Greek Testament, which made no mark, and appears to have dropped out of issue. Not one commentary or gloss on any book of Scripture, not one treatise bearing on critical problems, no works cognate to the Introductions and Bible

Dictionaries elsewhere current, have issued from this quarter. Religious philosophy is somewhat better off, being represented by Cardinal Newman's 'Grammar of Assent,' Mr. W. G. Ward's 'Essays,' F. Harper's 'Metaphysics of the School,' and Mr. St. George Mivart's little 'Philosophical Catechism for Beginners' and 'Contemporary Evolution.' Apologetics are a blank, and so are both dogmatic and moral theology, for which foreign text-books are used. There is a 'Catholic Dictionary' by Messrs. Addis and Arnold, respectable in its way, but not by any means epoch-making, and with unmistakable traces of the censor's shears; there are the popular writings of Faber, bearing about the same relation to theology as meringues and ice-creams do to a nutritious dietary; there are his Hymns, and Edward Caswall's translations of those in the Missal and Breviary, and there is a copious supply of small devotional works (mostly translations or adaptations of foreign writers), together with a perennial stream of controversial matter, more forcible in wording than in argument, and sufficiently emancipated from the trammels of prosaic fact to allow of the widest play to imagination and invention. A great deal more is needed before there can be so much as a show of competition with the recent theological literature of the Church of England, even leaving all the older portion of it out of the comparison. The result, then, of this part of the present inquiry is, that the convert element has not made good the practical deficiencies of Anglo-Romanism, which hamper it in its struggle for existence and for ultimate victory.

Coming to the fourth and last question, that of the actual progress made by the Roman mission towards that ultimate victory which would make Great Britain once more a Roman Catholic land, there is a slight initial difficulty caused by the absence of a religious census in this country. But a fairly adequate instrument of calculation is supplied by the Registrar-General's marriage-returns, because the discipline maintained in the Anglo-Roman Church in respect of marriage is so strict, that no deduction need be made for possible marriages by non-Roman ministers, or before a registrar, in the case of its members. A few statistics from past years will suffice.

In 1845, before the great Irish immigration, the proportion of Roman Catholic marriages to the whole number was 1.95 per cent. In 1850, after the immigration, it rose to 3.68 per cent. In 1853, while the 'Papal Aggression' agitation was in force, it touched its highest point, being 5.09 per cent. In 1865, when the panic had subsided, it dropped to 4.71 per cent. In 1874 it was down to 4.04 per cent.

The

The next year, 1875, when the Public Worship Regulation Act was put in force, it rose to 4·18 per cent., and there was some small further increase afterwards, rising as high as 4·25 per cent.; but the returns for 1885 (the latest issued) show a marked decrease. Out of a total of 197,745 marriages registered, 139,913 were according to the rites of the Church of England, and no more than 8162 were Roman Catholic, being just 4·13 per cent.—a ratio lower than that of 1875, as it in turn is lower than that of 1865. This shows that there is no perceptible gain, that no advance has been made towards the goal of national conversion, and that Roman Catholics now are, relatively to the whole nation, just where they were in 1669. The only point open to debate is whether the Roman Catholic body is merely stationary or actually receding in proportion to the entire population.

On the broadest survey of the situation, the fact is simply that, fifty years ago, Roman Catholics constituted nearly one-third of the population of the United Kingdom, and now are reduced to one-seventh. Of course this is almost entirely due to the great diminution of the population of Ireland, which has continued to go back ever since 1846, but it is none the less decisive of the general issue.

But limiting the inquiry to England and Wales, how do matters stand? There is a very active Roman propaganda constantly at work, by no means fastidious as to its instruments and methods, rather proceeding by ways which are not only questionable, but which have been called in question without satisfactory reply. Of course it accomplishes something, and desires the reputation of accomplishing very much more, so that there are constant rumours of great proselyting successes, and assertions of annual thousands of converts being made, are freely uttered. Moreover, the fact, that there is a powerful contingent of Roman Catholics on the London press, secures publicity for all Roman Catholic doings likely to give an impression of the growth and influence of the Anglo-Roman Church. Above all, the policy of Cardinal Manning has been to advertise himself and his communion by continually keeping it before the public eye, and by posing in his own person as an English patriot and philanthropist, though simultaneously abetting the Nationalist party in Ireland, and assenting to, if not enjoining, that dead silence as to the crimes of the National League which has been steadily observed by the Anglo-Roman episcopate, whose flocks are composed mainly of Irish by birth or descent, and who are afraid of telling them unpalatable, however wholesome and necessary, truths. From the manner

in which the public demonstrations are pre-arranged, and the press is worked to advertise them, a very natural idea of the rapid spread of Roman Catholicism has been created, in spite of those rebutting figures in the Registrar-General's returns. The party politics of the day also sometimes affect the press so as to subserve Roman Catholic interests. Thus, towards the close of 1887, a Roman Catholic controversialist delivered a series of lectures against the Church of England in a large town with a considerable Roman Catholic factor in the population. These lectures were fully reported in the local newspapers of both political parties, but a reply from the Anglican clergy was refused admission, each editor being afraid of alienating the Roman Catholics from his own party, if anything distasteful to them were suffered to appear. And it would not be strange, if many persons, unaware of the secret motives at work, attributed the absence of any reply to the strength of the indictment, and the impossibility of rebutting it.

But this is all for the general public. Amongst themselves, and in publications which the general public never see, the Anglo-Romans sorrowfully admit that they are actually losing ground, and cannot maintain their numbers, even with their triple source of supply, births, immigration, and proselytes. An article in the 'Month' for July, 1885, on the Conversion of England, contains some statistics which are worth examination.

The writer, on a comparison of authorities, computes the Roman Catholic population of England and Wales as 800,000 in 1841. The increase of the whole population since 1841 has been 62 per cent. (30,537,275, as compared with 18,845,424); and if this had extended to the Roman Catholic portion, their increase should have been 496,000, giving a total of 1,296,000, without making any allowance for converts or immigrants. But there has in fact been a very large immigration, especially from Ireland. This has brought a million more to swell their numbers. Accordingly, this is how they ought to stand now:—

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Roman Catholic population in 1841 .. .. | 800,000   |
| Increase at 62 per cent. .. ..          | 500,000   |
| Irish-born residents .. ..              | 780,000   |
| Children of Irish-born parents .. ..    | 280,000   |
|   | <hr/>     |
|   | 2,360,000 |

Estimating the actual numbers from the statistics of children in Roman Catholic poor schools, and rightly noting that Roman Catholic marriages are both early and prolific, the writer puts them at 1,362,760 (which is slightly above the result brought out

out from the marriage returns), denoting an actual loss of one million. Thus, if there had been no Irish immigration, the Anglo-Roman body would have seriously diminished in numbers, and as that immigration has now become very small, it can be no longer relied on for preventing future shrinkage. The writer ascribes the Roman Catholic losses to two main causes, the School Board system, which draws away children from the Roman Catholic schools, and the pervading influence of the Church of England, which, though he says it must crumble sooner or later, and is actually crumbling now, nevertheless in the meanwhile 'has sucked into itself, or at all events sucked out of their faith, a vast number of the Catholics born and educated in this country. Its schools, its money, its gentry, its prestige, have so completely overshadowed all else, that somehow or other, thousands of Catholics have disappeared into it or into the indifference it tends to produce. This makes exertions which would be quite sufficient in a Catholic country to prevent leakage quite insufficient in England.'\*

An article to the same general effect in the 'Tablet' of May 21, 1887, lamenting that the yearly losses of the Anglo-Romans largely exceed their gains, agrees only in part with the 'Month' in assigning the cause. It holds that the diminution is chiefly amongst the children, but it attributes the losses not to the secularist action of the Board School system, but to organized proselytism on the part of Protestants, especially as regards Manchester. The assertion is made, that parents are bribed or children enticed away, so that Protestant schools and institutions are crowded with Roman Catholic children, who are thus effectually withdrawn from their own Church.

A second article in the 'Month' for October, 1886, on 'The Church and the People,' fully confirms the statements of the earlier paper, and adds that although largely ignored, it has nowhere been controverted. The writer allows that the material progress of his co-religionists has been very great, that their churches and religious communities multiply fast, and that prejudices against them are dying out. '*E pur non si muove.*' 'Conversions amongst the educated classes are comparatively unfrequent,' by reason of the rival attractions of Ritualism (which, by the by, is credited in the earlier paper with promoting such meagre supply as is obtainable), 'although the experience

---

\* This admission ought to correct the misapprehension current amongst Non-conformists, that the Church of England is a mere feeder for the Church of Rome; and perhaps a more directly cogent answer is that the ratio of Roman Catholics in Scotland to the population is more than double the English ratio, being 326,000 out of 3,750,000, or over 8½ per cent.



of priests in large missions is that among the poor conversions are numerous.'

'It is not, however, so much that converts are fewer, as that our own people in great numbers are falling away. It was but the other day that I was told of a family of three generations, numbering forty-seven in all; of these, only the original father and mother are faithful to their religion, which has been entirely abandoned by the remaining five-and-forty. The causes of this falling off are also many and varied: mixed marriages, Board Schools, the un-Catholic atmosphere which we breathe—these are but some among them.'

What, then, is the meaning of the enormous increase of plant, as attested by the statistics at the outset of the present article? It is partly speculation, precisely analogous to the polished granite pillars and plate-glass windows of the offices of some company which is trying to procure business, and knows that it must seem to be prosperous before it can begin to be so. It is partly mere advertisement and *réclame*. And it is further a means of providing for a large number of people who have thus comfortable berths secured for them. The funds for the purpose are drawn partly from wealthy converts, and are partly furnished from foreign countries, in the hopes that lavish expenditure, continued sufficiently long, may at length yield some proportionate harvest. But what this display actually amounts to is pitilessly summed up by Lord Braye, himself a convert, as follows:—

'It is better to build the Church than churches. He builds the walls of Jerusalem in England who advocates and makes some effort at bringing about some sort of understanding and cohesiveness among our forces. Is there any religious body in this country where so much fine energy is wasted? Learned priests without any one to buy their learned books. Aged professors with two pupils apiece. A dozen large colleges, when one public school would be amply sufficient. Dioceses with scarcely a parish priest to a county. What is the use, under these foggy circumstances, of building great churches in a place where you hardly get a server for the mass? Very many towns have a congregation in a poor garret, and there is an ill-paid duplicating \* priest; whereas in green deserts of country you may stumble on a cathedral, or more likely the foundations of a cathedral, founded firmly in debt, whose unfinished aisles are the sign of some never realised æstheticism.'—'Present State of the Church in England,' vii.

Lord Braye was loudly and angrily blamed for publishing such unpleasant secrets, but no one ventured to dispute the

\* That is, a priest who has to say more than one Mass on the same day—a practice resorted to only in emergency.

accuracy of his picture. Mr. Bampfield's letter, 'Our Losses,' is in some respects more important still as evidence. Not only is it nearly the most recent public utterance upon the subject, but it has almost an official character. The writer is connected with the Roman church of St. Andrew's, Barnet, and addresses himself to Canon Wenham of Mortlake, who seems to have proposed the subject of the decline of Roman Catholic numbers to a clerical conference, with a view of eliciting suggestions as to its causes and the possible remedies (several similar conferences appear to have been held in various places lately for the same purpose); and Mr. Bampfield, not for a moment disputing the fact that there is a very marked decline, supplies, alike by his assignment of causes and his proposals for remedies, some highly useful information.

Beginning, as is professionally incumbent upon him, with some words on the need of more fervent prayer, especially addressed to the newly canonized or beatified 'warriors of the Reformation,' he passes on to temporal measures, significantly giving the foremost place to more active and systematic efforts at proselytism, not merely for the sake of increasing their numbers (for he seems to allow that the converts may be few, or the efforts actually unsuccessful), but for the sake of inspiring the existing Roman flock, who are cheered by the smallest accretions from without, and even by the attempt to secure them. It is the Napoleonic and Romanoff policy of foreign war to avert domestic revolution, applied in another sphere. The next suggestion is really a subordinate part of the first, being that 'Lectures on the Faith,' addressed to outsiders, but carefully given a non-controversial colour by being entitled 'Explanations,' couched in a familiar and amusing style, so as to make the hearers laugh, and accompanied with music, but not with devotions, might be made very attractive. He urges that, even apart from their probable influence on outsiders, nay, although no converts were made by their means, they would be of great use to Roman Catholics, inasmuch as they would make them proud of their belief, and would in many cases teach them indirectly what they now, from supposing themselves too old to be taught, or too wise to need teaching, are very far from knowing, especially those who come from Ireland. And the plan might possibly get hold of the indevout, who have given up Mass and Sacraments without actually ceasing to be Roman Catholics, but who would come to a lecture not addressed to themselves, so that they would not fear any rebuke to their own consciences. Outdoor preaching, attempts to abate prejudice by abandoning the policy of isolation which the Roman Catholic clergy and laity have

have mostly adopted, and mixing more freely in municipal and social life with non-Romans, and a larger use of lay-help, are amongst his next suggestions. Some of his remarks under this last head are instructive. He says that the celibate priest is no match for the married parson, or rather

'The clergyman is not so much to be feared as the clergyman's wife and daughters, and his curate's wife and daughters, and the pious women who rejoice to relieve the misfortune of their celibacy by running from house to house, subverting the faith of the unlearned and unwary. All manner of welcome gifts are freely distributed by this agency, and fairly beat the priest, who does not know the mystery of girls' dresses, is ignorant of the art of cooking, and has but scant sympathy with the teaching of infants. He leaves the home of the mixed marriage, where indeed he is well liked, and the children crowd round him, and there enters after him, by right of the presence of the non-Catholic parent, the district visitor, armed with her doll for Eliza, and her picture-book for Johnny, and the jelly for the sick cripple. Poor Priest! the Faith is strong, and the power of prayer is great, but human nature and the world, the devil and the district visitor, are strong also.'

The amiable spirit of tolerance disclosed by bracketing the second pair of adverse agencies deserves recognition. Mr. Bampffield replies to a possible suggestion, that nuns might be employed to counteract the district visitors, that nuns are few, poor, and without social position, which powerfully assists the visiting ladies, while in many parts of the country there are no nuns to be had. He allows the difficulties which beset the question of lay-help, especially as respects men, who are apt to be inconveniently independent, and not submissive enough to the clergy, but that such help is so imperatively needed that efforts must be made to procure it, and to minimize this risk. Mr. Bampffield is express in saying, that absolute unquestioning submission is the layman's first duty, and it is rather that he should be convinced of this than that the clergy should abate any whit of their claims upon his obedience, which Mr. Bampffield recommends as the method to pursue.\* As to schools, his language is despondent, for he says that poorly paid lay-teachers, who have not the spirit of devotion which inspires volunteer helpers, cannot give the necessary tone, and there are

---

\* An article on 'The Work of the Laity,' in the 'Dublin Review' of July, 1887, by a Roman Catholic layman, directly traverses Mr. Bampffield's position, and attributes much of the failure of Roman Catholicism in England to the scanty use made of lay-help by the clergy, who desire to officialize everything, and to keep all power in their own hands, assigning to the laity no other function than that of providing funds over the administration of which they are allowed no control.

not enough members of teaching orders to supply the need ; while as to Sunday-schools, he recommends large improvements, most of which are directly taken from Church of England methods, though he does not say so. He implies that the Catechisms in use for Roman Catholic children are ill adapted to their purpose, as being too longwinded, and do not remain in the memory in after life. He recommends children's services and Eucharists, encouragement of healthy and innocent amusements, the multiplication of mission-rooms in squalid districts, where Mass and other services might be held in the midst of those who will not, or at any rate do not, come to church, and the introduction of the practice of family prayer, so familiar in England, and so nearly unknown throughout the Roman Catholic world, perhaps his most remarkable testimony to the broad fact that Roman Catholics are driven to imitate Anglicanism, at the very time when a few misguided Anglicans think success to be had only by imitating the most capital blunders of Rome.

An almost deeper sore is probed in the paragraphs devoted to the hindrances which impede the Roman priest's activity, and the first place is here given to the financial troubles of the Anglo-Roman body. 'First, debt ; and second, debt ; and third, still debt : or, if not debt, poverty, poverty, poverty.' He dilates on this theme at some length, and in a disheartened tone, which shows how serious is the evil. And it may be reasonably asked, how this squares with the lavish increase of clerical plant, set out in the opening paragraphs of this article. Lord Braye lifts a corner of the curtain, but it is easy to pull it further away. The fact is, that only a tiny minority of the many new and stately Roman Catholic churches rising on all sides are legitimately entitled to keep their Dedication festival, though of great liturgical importance in the Roman system, for this festival is the anniversary of the consecration, a ceremony not ordinarily permitted till the building is free from debt. But most of these edifices are mortgaged up to the windows, and little prospect of discharging the encumbrances appears ; thus emphasizing the statement already made, that speculative advertisement, rather than genuine demand, has prompted the erection of a large proportion of them.

Nor is this quite the whole of the matter. Such success as really has attended the Roman propaganda here has been principally obtained amongst the wealthy and titled class, though even the extent of that success has been much exaggerated. The House of Lords consists of some 540 members, and there are seventy-eight Scottish and Irish peers who do  
not

not sit there, making about 620 in round numbers. But the total of Roman Catholic peers is no more than forty, of whom twenty-seven belong to hereditary Roman Catholic families, leaving only thirteen converts. Two heirs to peerages are also converts; but, on the other hand, the heirs of three convert peers are not Roman Catholics, so that the total number shows no signs of increase. And here comes in the consideration, that the measure of success, actually attained among the higher classes, has been due, where the conversions have not been spontaneous, to the efforts of the convert clergy—one of the most active of whom as a proselytizer won for himself the title of ‘Apostle of the Genteels’—whose personal refinement and culture, contrasting with the habits of the much humbler Roman clergy of Irish or foreign extraction, made them acceptable and influential. But as the older convert clergy rapidly die out, there are no means of supplying their place, for the newer converts, as already mentioned, are both scanty in number and of exceedingly poor quality, so that the tone and level of the Anglo-Roman clergy are, from the social and intellectual standpoint, steadily deteriorating; and they are becoming at once even less in touch with the nation than heretofore, as well as less capable of winning educated converts, or keeping a hold on those already obtained. The authorities of the Roman Church here are fully alive to the seriousness and imminence of this peril, but are unable to devise any means of averting it. Nor, indeed, is it possible that they should, for, to cite but one instance, it is plain that nothing can compensate for the loss of prestige which must follow on the disappearance of Cardinal Newman’s unique personality from the scene, whenever that event takes place. The mere fact that he is a Roman Catholic, and a zealous one, has been for more than forty years the most powerful argument adduced on the Roman side, so far as a large section of educated persons are concerned. But this attraction is already half traditional, continuing chiefly amongst those who themselves came under the personal influence of John Henry Newman in his Oxford days, or have talked familiarly with his old disciples, and it cannot, in the nature of things, be permanent.

It may be noted that, in the various confessions of failure cited above, the reasons assigned are all, so to speak, external. In none, save Lord Bray’s, is there present any admission, or even any consciousness, that defects inherent in the Roman system itself, as distinguished from minor errors of judgment in those who administer it here (and Lord Bray goes no further in his strictures), can be accountable for the disappointment of the  
once

once sanguine expectations of easy and rapid triumph. There is, however, another avowal of failure which does indirectly hint at something of the kind, namely, that contributed by Mr. St. George Mivart to the 'Dublin Review' for July, 1884, under the title of 'The Conversion of England.' He writes with caution, but what he has got to say is briefly, that the Italianization of Anglo-Romanism has been a fatal blunder; that the lack of good vernacular services is a formidable hindrance in a country possessed of a Common Prayer-book, which is mainly a presentation of the old Catholic liturgy in the noblest and most magnificent form of the English tongue; that the 'objects of piety' in Roman churches are painfully shocking, arousing contempt or pity in non-Romans, and are 'apt to call up the flush of shame on the cheek of the Catholic layman who cares for his religion'; that the Anglo-Roman clergy are of low intellectual attitude, are narrow and cliquish, and have no national loyalty of feeling; and that the laity, resembling them in lack of intellectual vigour, exhibit marked abstention from giving them personal help in religious matters.

This goes more home to the point than the other reasons tendered, and it may be specially observed that two of those reasons quite fail to stand inquiry. The Board School system, which does undoubtedly press with unfairness upon Roman Catholics, has not been long enough at work to account for a leakage amongst adults; and there is little or no evidence that any large measure of counter-proselytism is in operation. In truth, whether for good or ill, the Anglican clergy are markedly uncontroversial and unproselytizing in temper; besides which, the total failure of the long-continued and costly efforts of the kind made in Ireland is at once a dissuasive from copying them here, and a reason for doubting their success if attempted. A wider survey would teach the apologists, that this retrogression of Roman Catholicism is not peculiar to England, but is to be seen in operation all over the world, as the result and Nemesis of the dear-bought victory of Jesuit Ultramontaniam. Evidence to this effect is accumulated by the Abbé Roca, in his vigorous, if crotchety, book '*Le Christ, le Pape et la Démocratie*' (Paris, 1884), and by F. Curci in '*La Nuova Italia ed i Vecchi Zelanti*' (Firenze, 1881), and '*Il Vaticano Regio*' (Firenze, 1883). The survey includes the United States, South America, France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Bulgaria, and the record is alike in all; the Latin Church, they say, degraded and paganized, its clergy forfeiting the respect of their flocks, and those flocks either sinking into total indifference or seceding in thousands to some other form of belief. Both of them devout Roman Catholics,

Catholics, Roca and Curci, believe that administrative reforms alone, without any way touching doctrine, will suffice to remedy the evils they expose; and this fact is of importance, since it bars the defence that their testimony may be rejected, as that of crypto-Protestant enemies of the Church. One sore they do not probe (indeed, it could not have come within F. Curci's range of observation), that of the disproportionately large ratio of Roman Catholic criminals in every country where a mixed population makes comparison feasible. Here in England, where the Roman Catholics are 4·13 per cent. of the whole population, and 3·90 of Londoners, they ought to be in a much smaller ratio amongst convicted prisoners. And that for four reasons: that the ordinary member of the criminal class neither has nor pretends to have any religion at all, whereas the Roman Catholic acknowledges the Divine obligation of certain tenets and precepts which make for virtue, and recognises the authority of his clergy; that the Roman Catholic clergy are twice as numerous as the Anglican in their ratio to their laity; that all persons of no religion are set down to the Church of England in official returns; and that old Roman Catholic gaol-birds customarily declare themselves as Church of England, simply because there is only an Anglican chapel and chaplain in most prisons, and attendance in the one, and visits from the other, serve to make some little change, to break the maddening monotony of prison-life. With all these causes at work, it would be reasonable to look for as low a ratio as three per cent. of Roman Catholic prisoners, save in exceptional places like Liverpool, where Roman Catholics are more than a fourth of the population. But the actual results range from fifteen, twenty, and forty per cent., up to gaols (as in Liverpool) where the Roman Catholic prisoners are considerably in excess of all others confined. In two great cities, the Roman Catholic female prisoners have for several years averaged three times the numbers of the remainder of their sex. Some statistics given in the 'Times' of September 16, 1887, as to the criminal statistics of Canada, illustrate this matter. The population of the Province of Ontario in 1881 was 1,923,228, of whom 320,839, or sixteen per cent., were Roman Catholics. The criminal convictions in the same year were 6940, of which 3844, or 59·22 per cent., were of Roman Catholic offenders. There were 8118 commitments to the Central Prison, Toronto, between 1873 and 1886, of which 2812, or 34·66 per cent., were of Roman Catholics, and the ratio in the Mercer Reformatory for women during the same period was 35·77 per cent. In Ireland, even if agrarian crimes be omitted from the reckoning, the Roman



Roman Catholic convicts are largely in excess of the ratio of population, and have a virtual monopoly of all the graver offences, for the Protestant criminals are seldom arraigned for any save petty misdemeanours. And in the United States it has been publicly alleged of late, so far as appears without authoritative contradiction, that an overwhelming majority of the habitual criminals and of the public courtezans come from the Roman Catholic section of the population.

This denotes entire failure of the Roman Catholic Church in the function of moral guidance, well-nigh the most important which a Church can fulfil, and if not so grave a fault as the direct complicity in crime, which is charged against the Irish Roman clergy by so ardent a Nationalist and Roman Catholic as the late P. J. Smyth, M.P., in his 'Priest in Politics,' yet it is akin thereto, and may well lead to the withdrawal of such as have their attention directed to it, and to all which it involves.

It is not a little interesting to see how the remedies suggested by writers in the 'Dublin Review' and the 'Month' to arrest the leakage from the Roman communion here all take the form of copying methods employed by the Church of England, notably in the performance of public worship, by such means as the freer use of vernacular services and hymns. Little has been done by the authorities appealed to, however, save an endeavour to win over a body of new proselytes large enough to make good the losses. A new departure was indeed taken in 1886 by the Anglo-Roman hierarchy, who then issued a vernacular 'Manual of Prayers for Congregational Use;' but it is a meagre compilation, of slender literary or liturgical merit, and has not so far been a success commercially. But there has been of late a great recrudescence of anti-Church of England controversy on the Roman part all over the country, stimulated by the consciousness of failure and the approaching peril of an unlettered priesthood, since if the lost ground cannot be at once recovered, it will be too late to hope for it. The recent demonstration from the Liberationist party, in favour of disestablishment and disendowment, induced the Church Defence Institution to organize lectures and to circulate tracts, vindicating the ancient claim of the Church of England to property, which she holds by an older tenure than any other in England. The Roman Catholics have replied in local newspapers and in pamphlets by setting up the counter-claim, that their communion is the only legitimate heir of the ancient English Church, and that they should enjoy the status and endowments usurped by Anglicans, although they can show neither continuity of corporate

porate existence nor of ecclesiastical system with the pre-Reformation Church, from which they differ in belief, in laws, and in organization. But as their assertions are promptly and effectively corrected, they are not likely to take much by their motion.

There is thus no probability whatever of any considerable successes being achieved by the Anglo-Roman body, since the causes which tend to deplete it are in permanent action, whereas those which have furthered its objects at times have been accidental and intermittent, while many of them have disappeared altogether in the process of Church revival in England, which has silenced objections by removing abuses and defects.

That there will continue to be a certain leakage to the Roman Church is pretty certain, because there are many minds for which it has irresistible attractions, minds which are fascinated by precisely those claims and qualities that repel clear-headed thinkers. If conversion to Rome were usually a matter of calm inquiry and dispassionate search after truth, it would speedily assume vanishing dimensions; but being almost always either a matter of mere emotion, or of wish to be rid of personal responsibility, supposed capable of being transferred to the shoulders of a director commissioned by an infallible Church, it is not likely to cease, particularly as most of those who secede are as incapable as unwilling to follow the thread of serious argument, and the clearest disproofs of matters which please their fancy can find no entrance to their minds. But their number tends to diminish steadily, and their transfer of allegiance produces no sensible change in the balance of parties, since they are seldom known outside their own immediate locality and connexions, and have little influence there. Mr. St. George Mivart has said frankly, that the Divine blessing has never rested on attempts to bring England back by force to the Roman obedience; and the facts we have here marshalled, derived mainly from official or from Roman Catholic sources, establish that the later methods, which promised more fairly for a time, have been also branded with failure, and that in so marked a degree as to make it the plainest duty of English Roman Catholics to reform themselves, before they can reasonably call on Anglicans to take them for models in belief and practice, or can hope even to check the leakage which continuously drains their own communion, and more than neutralizes all their sources of increase.

---

ART. III.—1. *Final Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry.* Printed for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1886.

2. *The Recent State of Material Progress in England.* Address to the Economic Science, and Statistic Section of the British Association. By Robert Giffen, D.C.L. London, 1887.

3. *Inaugural Address to the Royal Statistical Society.* By the Right Honourable George J. Goschen, M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer. The 'Times,' December 7th, 1887.

HER MAJESTY'S Ministers were able to advise the Queen to refer, in her speech from the throne at the last Prorogation of Parliament, to an improvement in the prospects of trade. 'There are some grounds for hoping, that the grave depression under which all commercial and industrial interests in this country have lain for so long is assuming a less severe character.' For this cautious and moderate expression of anticipation the Cabinet had no doubt sufficient warrant, in the information and statistics before them. But we regret to be unable to resist the conclusion that, while no mitigation of the general severity has yet made itself felt to any considerable extent, the effects of the depression are reaching classes which have hitherto been exempt from its influence. Not only so, but its continuance is bringing to their knees more and more of those persons of all ranks of life who have stubbornly and bravely resisted its power. Of the heaviness and exceptional duration of this depression much has been written and more said, and it is not our purpose here to dwell upon its characteristics, or examine a reason for or against a hope that it may be passing away. Nor do we propose to analyse the many and various economical causes which have been assigned for its origin and development. Bad seasons, bad fiscal arrangements, imperfect conditions of competition; these and other such matters we mean to leave alone. They have been thoroughly and effectually criticized already. But we think that, in the acute attention that has been paid to them, there has been no sufficient attempt to enquire, first, whether to the growth of trade depression any subjective causes have contributed; and secondly, whether from that growth any lessons can be learned which may tend to the improvement of our national character.

Englishmen have always been ready to learn what was to be learned from disaster. Our national history is full of instances in which the uses of adversity have been sweet. 'Meres profundo pulchrior evenit' has been often true of our own country in her commercial as well as in her military and her moral progress.

progress. But this has been due to moral qualities, which thrive more in circumstances of difficulty than of ease, the brightness of which prosperity is terribly apt to dim, and which, if suffered to fall in decay, rapidly lose their effect. The straightforward obstinacy, which made our small Peninsular battalions more than a match for their opponents in war, was paralleled by the honest and determined enterprise, which extended our trade in India and other parts of the Eastern world. In politics, to an unselfish and upright common-sense is due the avoidance of the dangers of kingcraft, on the one hand, and democratic licence on the other. In a word, we have prospered as a nation because determined to know no defeat, we have not sought victory by unworthy ways.

The national spirit is what it was ; the national characteristics are unchanged. We have no dread of serious deterioration, no fear that England is suffering from that decay which has so frequently crept upon nations that have attained a high degree of prosperity. But there are symptoms which are not wholly satisfactory, and which, if left uncured, may hereafter produce danger. Before we refer to them, let us make a very brief retrospect of the circumstances leading up to the depression of the present decade.

Up to the beginning of the present century England had, for many generations, suffered from either internal dissensions or external wars. Comparatively early in this century, the last great continental conflict in which she was concerned was brought to an end. Then for this country began a period of profound peace which, broken only by the Crimean war, the Indian Mutiny, and some minor wars of no great national influence, has lasted till now. We have been enabled to strengthen our Constitution, and to extend our commerce. We have managed our own affairs without more interference with those of our neighbours than has been necessary to our European position. We have consolidated and increased our hold on the staple industries of the world, and spared no pains to develop our commercial resources. The result has been an advance in prosperity, unequalled in our own history, and probably unsurpassed in that of any other nation. The rate of that advance, rapid enough up to 1870, received an exceptional acceleration then. During the following decade America, recovering from the throes of a huge domestic conflict, drew largely on our aid in the work of restoration and extension. The continental wars created a demand throughout Europe for our productions as well as for our sympathy. By 'leaps and bounds' our prosperity advanced. And the nature of the advance was such that its benefits were distributed

distributed among all classes of the community. Then, however, followed a serious check. The internal development of the great Western Continent made her more and more independent of our help. She wanted less of our steel rails for her railways, of our textile manufactures for her domestic use. On the other hand, her great agricultural resources enabled her to supply us largely with grain, and more recently with meat. Concurrently with this change, we have had to bear a succession of seasons of terrible disaster to our own land cultivation. And European nations have needed us less, whether as manufacturers or as carriers. What the amount of the check is, it is difficult accurately to gauge, but that it is grave no one can doubt. Mr. Giffen, than whom we can scarcely find a more careful student of economical problems or a more cautious exponent of the result of his studies, sets out, in the pamphlet before us, some valuable figures as regards the rate of increase of national prosperity. We will refer to one or two only. The income tax assessments, which were 308 millions in 1855, and 396 millions in 1865, advanced to 571 millions in 1875, but only grew to 631 millions in 1885. The receipts from railways goods traffic per head of population increased 63 per cent. between 1865 and 1875, and 8 per cent. between 1875 and 1885. The clearances of shipping in foreign trade increased 60 per cent. during the former decade, and 33 per cent. during the latter. From the arguments deducible from these figures Mr. Giffen makes certain deductions at the end of his pamphlet, to which our readers should refer, but it is clear that in the rapid advance, which continued in growing ratio up to 1875, there has been a heavy check, which, coupled with falls in prices and a redistribution of wealth to which we may hereafter allude, has produced a depression severely and generally felt.

This then is briefly the condition of affairs at the present time. Up to about ten years ago, our national material prosperity increased rapidly. Our resources are still growing, as a whole, but at much lessened rate and under decidedly disturbing conditions. What has been the effect of that rapid rate of progress? Did it produce any results which contributed to the check which followed it? and if so, is any lesson to be gathered from such results?

In examining these questions we are, at starting, met with an unsatisfactory consideration. The success of British commerce for many generations was due to the excellence of British manufacture. Our exports commanded a reputation all over the world, because it was known that they were good throughout. 'Esse non videri' was their characteristic aim. The Indian

ryot, the aristocrat of Versailles, the merchant of New York, each knew by extended experience that, if he bought an article produced in England, he would get a good thing, and not only one which seemed to be. Not only was our technical skill in advance of other nations, but our commercial integrity was without reproach. 'Thorough' was the trade word of our manufacturers as well as of our merchants. Can the same be said now? For an answer we have only to turn to the report of the Committee on the Merchandise Marks Act of last Session, or read the measure which resulted from their deliberations. Before that committee the prevalence of a host of fraudulent practices was divulged. Every sort of trap was shown to be set in the way of the unwary purchaser. Sell—'si possis recte, si non quocumque modo'—would seem to be the motto of wholesale and retail dealers. Foreign watches, put in cases marked with the English hall-mark, sold as of English make. Cigars branded Havana, and marked with such names as Cabanas or Partagas, which have never been west of Cape Clear. Scissors and knives, described as of best steel, which a real Sheffield blade would pare like a cheese. 'Ivory' which burned like tallow. Silk laden with chemically combined metals and sold by weight. Cotton goods flooding the India market, and stamped with false indications of measure. Trade-marks colourably imitated, with the object of fostering the sale of merchandise inferior to that sought for in the markets. These are some of the practices brought under notice of the committee. Asked to give his experience of the system of false marking as regards the class of goods of which he had special knowledge, Mr. Lord, twice President of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, said :—

'Some seven years ago, the attention of the Chamber of Commerce in Manchester was brought to the practice of false stamping of length of cotton goods, and a lengthy correspondence took place between the Manchester Chamber and the Chambers of Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras, with a view of checking the evil practice. At the instance of the Manchester Chamber, portions of the correspondence were published in the native papers in India, and for a time we thought the practice had diminished, though it never disappeared; but during the last few years it has revived and to a much larger extent and in worse forms, so that in particular classes of goods it becomes exceedingly difficult for those who do not resort to these practices to do business at all. In many cases the indication of the length of goods is no real indication of the actual length supplied.'

Mr. Lord's evidence was amply corroborated by other persons  
well

well competent to speak as regards cotton, and was supplemented by similar evidence relative to other trades. One witness, indeed, was bold enough to say that no buyer of cigars, no smoker, was in the least deceived by the use of the word Havana on cigar-boxes. It was certainly alleged during the period covered by the investigations of the Committee, that British merchants were more sinned against than sinning, but there were amply sufficient facts brought forward to show, that fraudulent practices are not confined to the other side of the waters surrounding Great Britain.

We have referred to the report of this Committee because it affords recent and official evidence of the evil state of affairs to which we refer. Abundance of less official proof is not wanting. How many householders have suffered from the scamped work of jerry builders? How many lives have been sacrificed to improperly-constructed drains and sewers, the faults of which are not due to ignorance of principles, but to either absolute neglect of work or the use of cheap and bad materials? How many of those that go down to the sea in ships, and occupy their business in the great waters, have perished in consequence of the carelessness, or worse, of shipbuilders and shipowners? 'Caveat emptor' is a sound economical maxim. But if the need for caution is too persistently pressed upon him, that caution will inevitably take a form which will make those through whom he suffers rue. English commerce unquestionably must have greater difficulties in commanding the markets of the world than was the case when the competition of other nations was hindered from causes no longer in operation. But these difficulties must be enhanced, and not lessened, if corrupt methods are sought for their avoidance. The reputation for unquestionable excellence, which British goods once enjoyed, is sadly impaired. As yet the downward progress has not reached a position from which there is no return. But there is ample cause for fear that such a position may be reached, before the danger is realized which would inevitably follow. Even in our own markets the competition of the foreigner is terribly severe, and we are forced to believe, that much of that competition is in excellence of workmanship, skill in compilation of material, and truth of description. If we ever lose our hold on foreign markets, the responsibility will lie heavily on those who have swerved from the absolutely honest practices which were once the general characteristics of British trade.

For the corruption is by no means general. If the whole body of merchants and manufacturers could possibly be polled secretly, a large majority would, we believe, be found to be firm



followers of the narrow path of honesty. The artizans and hand-workers know and admit, that they have all to lose and nothing to gain from the fraudulent devices, which may for a time put money into their employers' pockets, but must in the end ruin both master and man. And lastly, the Legislature has shown a persistent determination to place as many impediments in the way of fraud as are possible from State interference. Henceforth it will be an offence to expose for sale any articles marked with a false description of origin, weight, quantity, or measure. The difficulty of imitating trade marks has been greatly augmented, and in a word Parliament has done its utmost to ensure that purchasers shall know, or at least have an opportunity of knowing, what it is that they are asked to buy. This is good as far as it goes. But great as the effect of such a law must be, it is not of itself sufficient to cure the evil. The merchants of England must themselves be the physicians of their own body. They can do more to restore it to health than either Parliament or Government departments. If the offending minority learn from the present depression of trade, that competition in misrepresentation is ruinous to those who indulge in it, adversity will have taught a useful lesson.

There are some conditions of which the effect on nations resembles greatly their effect on individuals. Prosperity in an individual tends to relaxation of effort, not universally so perhaps, because the greed for gain grows with gain, and the more some men have, the more they struggle to produce. But, as a rule, men who have attained success work less hard than those who have not. Prosperity has the same effect on a nation. The productive power of the people of Great Britain is as great as ever. For proof we may appeal to the terribly long hours of labour, which are the rule among certain classes of the community. But we doubt if the period of 'leaps and bounds' was not to produce some national relaxation of effort. The Saturday half-holiday is more general than it was, and Monday hours begin late. The bank holidays have resulted in an almost universal cessation of work, on the days selected by Sir John Lubbock. The newspapers have strenuously encouraged the view, that Easter, Whitsuntide, August, and Christmas, are periods at which it is reasonable to mitigate the severity of, if not altogether to knock off, work. There are many spheres of trade in which it is difficult to get orders executed during the 'holidays.' Not only on one day in every seven, but at intervals throughout the year, the nation rests. Now the considerations in favour of this habit are quite distinct from those which have to do with the resting of individuals. The recuperative

perative influence of rest in individuals is beyond question. Whether work be of body only, mind only, or both combined, it cannot be continued without intermission for long without suffering deterioration. Occasional rest is necessary. This principle is based on more than human sanction, and cannot be safely disregarded. Wise physicians prescribe rest, wise employers grant as well as take holidays. But it does not follow from this, that it is necessary or even desirable for practically the whole nation to leave off work for certain days or at certain periods. That any worker in the community should have a certain number of holidays may be and is wholly desirable. But it is not a corollary, that all should take them on the same days. At some risk of unpopularity we assert, that the cessation of national production on certain days, and its relaxation at certain seasons, is not an unmixed good.

Prosperity encourages luxury; luxury is enervating and encourages sloth; luxury tends to produce, and in the world's history has often produced, national decay. Now the growth of luxury for the last half century has been very great and very general. We do not merely mean, that the rate of living has advanced. This of itself is not necessarily to be deplored in any class, and in some classes is a matter for serious congratulation. That an agricultural labourer, for instance, should be able to procure more food, better clothing, better housing, and better education for his children, than he could fifty years ago, is a matter to rejoice over, and a state of things to secure by every proper means. What we mean is, that the scale of comfort deemed necessary by every class has enormously grown. Take the upper classes. The great houses throughout the country are administered in a style, the increase of which is quite disproportionate to the growth of income of their owners. The expenditure on far-fetched foods and most *recherché* wines, the most costly amusements, has vastly developed. And the tendency is ever upward. Young men beginning life try to start, where their fathers left off. Some quarter of a century ago there was a discussion in the newspapers as to the prudence or otherwise of young persons in the upper classes marrying on an income of three hundred a-year. Three times that income would be considered inadequate now by the critics who conducted the discussion. This is not a statistical report, and we do not weary our readers with figures; but a very few may be quoted from the trade returns of 1857 and 1886, to illustrate our contention. In 1857 the value of sealskins imported into the United Kingdom was 273,654*l.*; in 1886 it was 584,543*l.* In the former year, watches to the value of 209,380*l.* were imported; in the

the latter, to the value of 711,712*l.* Glass of all kinds imported in 1857 cost 121,725*l.*; in 1886, 1,544,512. For feathers there was no return in 1857; but in 1872 they were valued at 449,785*l.*; in 1886, at 1,287,595*l.* These may fairly be called articles of luxury. Elsewhere we find the same thing. How many more race-meetings are there now than there were in 1850; how many more packs of hounds; how many more pheasants shot, deer stalked, and salmon killed? In 1850 the licences for male servants of all classes issued amounted to 123,579; in 1870, to 284,953; in 1884, an exception having been made by the Act 39 Vict. c. 6, as regards boys or men casually employed, to 185,212. The amount received from game-licences was in 1850, 143,405*l.*; in 1877, in spite of material reductions made in the interval, 200,311*l.* The number of high-class clubs in London has hugely grown; and there is scarcely a provincial town of consequence in which there are not more than one. First-rate hotels and expensive restaurants are established at a yearly increasing rate. The 'Cock,' with its plump head-waiter and its pint of port, is replaced by the dazzling establishments of Regent Street, the Circus, and the Strand, with their armies of attendants and their magnums of 1880 Champagne. The fish dinners at Richmond and Greenwich of 1850, what were they in quality and number compared with the fish dinners now? Theatres and places of amusement of a costly character abound.

The entertainments and hospitalities of the upper classes are conducted on a far more lavish scale than they were forty years ago. The London balls and the country house parties of the present day are given in a style which the hosts and hostesses of the first half of the century never thought of seeking to reach. Who hunts now in the manner and with the equipment of the most celebrated Nimrods of the Regency, or even the early days of Her Majesty's reign? The servants of a hunt now are mounted and clad better than the masters were then. In shooting, where are the days in which the Squire and one or two of his friends used to wander over the stubbles early in September, at the heels of Ponto and Don, and return amply contented with a few brace of partridges, or later in the year with twenty couple or so of cock-pheasants from unnetted woods? Now the bags of partridges are reckoned by hundreds of brace, and the greater days of covert-shooting often return a total of four figures.

In every particular the luxury of life of the upper classes is enormously greater than it was before the Crimean war. There are indeed two qualifications to this proposition, which force themselves on our attention. The first is that there is no falling-off in the physical power or energy of well-born English men and

and English women. Luxury has not certainly had the effect of producing bodily weakness. The love of athletic exercises is greater now among upper-class Englishmen than it ever was, and the gentler sex show a growing tendency to forsake their own occupations for those of their brothers and fathers. The pastimes of the present day involve a very considerable use of muscle and sinew. The playing fields at Eton are as capable as ever they were of fostering the pluck, the stubbornness, and the patience, which won the battle of Waterloo. The feats of endurance and power performed on the mountain, in the forest, on the moor, the running-path, the river, or the cricket-ground, outshine those accomplished by men of bygone days. And the spirit which leads to them has shown its influence in such campaigns as our armies have been called upon to undertake.

It is rather on the habits, the tastes, and the views of duty, that prosperity has had influence, than on bodily power or endurance. As a rule, the upper classes have been able to live lives of ease, and they have largely availed themselves of their opportunities. The national circumstances compelling men of the upper classes to exercise self-denial and undergo privations are less pressing than they have ever been. The almost absolute disappearance of feudal habits and ideas has left the great landowners free from many responsibilities which in earlier days weighed on them. The exigencies of military service have not been great. There are, indeed, happily, not wanting numbers of men of high position who devote themselves to public or local affairs, with the sole and single idea of advancing the public interests. If we consider the enormous amount of labour undertaken by statesmen like Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington from pure sense of duty, we cannot say that the upper classes are universally indolent. And it is to be hoped that the day is far distant, when men of like education, ability, and position will not be available for the work of the State, and ready to undertake it. But still the pressure on the upper classes has, subject to a severe and recent qualification to which we will presently refer, not been such as to prevent a very general devotion of their means and their time to private occupations. The love of ease has grown. Perhaps it would be too much to say, that the pursuit of pleasure has been promoted to a duty, but it probably occupies a greater portion of men's time than it used. Purple and fine linen have abounded, and the men and women who have fared sumptuously every day 'cannot be counted on one hand.'

Recently, and here we pass to the second qualification, those of the upper classes, who are solely or principally dependent on the income derived from agricultural property, have been the subjects

subjects of strong reaction. Always buy land and never sell it, was the principle for getting rich, prescribed by a millionaire not long deceased: and up to the commencement of the present decade the principle was a sound one. From the end of the Peninsular war to about 1878 the value of agricultural land steadily advanced, not perhaps with such rapid strides as the value of other property, but still at a steady rate of upward progress. Land was universally regarded as a form of property so little likely to deteriorate that it was capable of bearing burdens to which no other form of property could be made liable, and being generally dealt with by law and custom in a way peculiar to itself. Land cannot fly away, was a proposition commanding general assent, and meaning that the returns derivable from it were not likely ever to disappear. The incomes of landowners, which phrase for our immediate purpose we confine to the owners of land proper and not messuages or tenements, grew. The returns of income-tax under Schedule A. showed a steady upward progress up the end of 1878. Then, however, came a change.

'The gross annual value of lands assessed under Schedule A. for 1879-80 was,' (the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, Mr.—now Sir—Algernon West, informed Lord Iddesleigh's Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry),

'for the United Kingdom, 69,548,796*l*. There was a new valuation in 1882-83, and the gross annual value then declined to 65,957,322*l*. Then the year 1883-84 exhibited a still further falling off, leaving a decline, apparent by the income-tax assessment up to 1883-84, of 4,106,569*l*. Then to this there should be added the capital value of the tax ultimately discharged from assessment on the ground of agricultural distress, or actually repaid in money for the two years 1883-84 and 1884-85, which in round figures will raise the above sum to, say, 5,000,000*l*. of annual value.'

And this is in spite of the deductions made by turning agricultural land to more profitable account. Since Sir Algernon West's evidence the decrease has gone on. And throughout the country there is abundance of evidence of severe pressure on owners of landed estates. In many cases of small properties, encumbered with the charges which in days of prosperity were so freely laid on land and so readily left there, the margin and profit has been reduced to vanishing-point. Even owners of great incomes are crippled. Perhaps it is not too much to say, that while poverty is advancing with rapid strides upon many of the former possessors of large revenues derived from agricultural land, the small owners are not without dread of actual destitution.

And

And this somewhat extraordinary phenomenon presents itself, that while there is an enormous wealth in the United Kingdom, and the demand for land for all those purposes with reference to which it may be called an *objet de luxe*, is as great as, if not greater than ever, landowners throughout the kingdom are in ever-growing numbers finding themselves obliged to decrease their establishments, if not to shut up their houses and cease to reside upon their estates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his able address to the Statistical Society, commented on the steady redistribution of wealth which is going on from causes outside State interference or control of individuals. In addition to this there is a steady transfer of the residential occupancy, and even the ownership of land from one class of wealthy Englishmen to another, the effect of which, if it continues, it is difficult to foresee, though its social, if not national influence, is sure to be considerable.

This state of things has sprung up, as we have said, during the last nine or ten years, and so far as the wealthy landowners of Great Britain are concerned, it necessitates a material reduction from our proposition, that the upper classes of the United Kingdom have been influenced by the prosperity which has on the whole, and in spite of recent reaction, characterized our National History since the end of the Peninsular war. But it only necessitates a reduction. The period of prosperity lasted for more than half a century. The lean years have not yet numbered ten. Habits encouraged by circumstances of comfort are easy to learn, not easy to unlearn. The difficulties, which have arisen from the decline of returns from agricultural property, would have been more easily met, and their effect would have been less severe, if the influence of previous years of ease had less prevailed. The pressure of hard times has come most quickly and most sharply on the agricultural classes, and of these the landowners have suffered as much as, if not more than others. Adversity is apt to call out the good qualities of classes as of individuals, and the present crisis is not likely to prove an exception to this rule.

No body of men more deserve our sympathy, and that of all who have studied their recent disasters, than the tenant-farmers of England. A combination of causes, springing from widely severed sources, has flooded them with difficulties. Bad seasons, increased foreign competition, increased price of labour,—these three have been the most important influences which have reduced occupiers of agricultural land from prosperity to distress. And if we urge certain considerations, tending to show that the habits and methods adopted in good times were such as, if not  
to

to increase, at any rate not to mitigate the severity of the recent and it is to be hoped temporary trials, we do so in a spirit of cordial friendliness to a class of men who are struggling with adverse circumstances, and with an earnest desire to help their struggles.

The advance of prosperity of the farming classes up to 1878 cannot be questioned. It may not have been as rapid—indeed, from inherent conditions it could not have been as rapid—as that of the classes producing commodities higher priced and liable to greater fluctuations of demand. But it was very decided and very effective. The habits and style of living of the tenant-farmers in 1878 differed greatly from those of their predecessors in 1818. ‘Girls milk the cow, Boys to the plough,’ or ‘Girls piano, Boys Tally ho!’ The rhyme, like most such catchwords of satire, was probably not wholly justified by facts, and an unfortunate allusion to it went far, not long ago, to lose a rising young politician his election in an agricultural constituency. But a great deal of truth underlies it. Farmers fared well for a quarter of a century or more, prior to the beginning of the wet cycle of years which has hit them so hard. Some of them were not only thrifty, but provident in the wider sense of the term. These men were able to accumulate capital, to extend their operations, to fortify their position. There are several instances in which fortunes, considerable even in those days, were amassed from agricultural profits. But a large number of the farming class took other advantage of the sunshine of their own prosperity. They adapted for their families and themselves a rate of domestic expenditure, and a system of domestic life, quite justifiable under circumstances then existing, and for which no blame can be attached to them, but based upon earnings the nature of which was not permanent. Mr. Druce, a Chancery barrister, and Secretary to the Farmers’ Club, was asked, when giving evidence before Lord Iddesleigh’s Commission, whether depression had been brought about by more extravagant living during the last ten years. His answer was, ‘I do not think that there is more extravagance in living amongst the farmers as a body *than in any other class* ;’\* and added, that farmers, when times were good, lived better and with more refinement than their forefathers did, qualifying this observation by reminding his questioner that Cobbett in 1821 made the same complaint. This was a cautious statement of a change of style apparent to every one conversant with the facts. We will put the case briefly thus: The good times encouraged

\* Third Report of the Royal Commission on Depression of Trade and Industry, Questions, 9196, etc.



in the farming classes a disposition to spend more money and time on the pleasures of life, and to devote less of the personal energy of themselves and other members of their families to the superintendence of business, and the searching for new methods of doing work. Not a grave indictment this, but one the truth of which it is difficult to gainsay, and which is consistent with our contention, that prosperity has considerably influenced all sections of the community.

There is another point, however, with regard to which agricultural depression is capable of teaching a lesson. Necessity is the mother of invention, and when old methods fail, new methods must be sought. Let us again hear Mr. Druce. Asked whether there had been sufficient enterprise in farmers, whether they had been sufficiently aware of how the market was going, and so changed the character of their farming, he referred to an instance of a farmer near Chelmsford, whose

'Cows are milked at 11 o'clock at night and at 11 o'clock in the morning, and the milk at night at once sent off to Chelmsford Station, and thence to London by a train leaving at 1 A.M., and is, or should be, delivered to the consumers in the East-end of London early in the same morning. The farmer who adopted this system keeps his cows in the stalls all the year round, and is one of the very few farmers who have not lost money during the past few years.'

Asked if this was an isolated case, he said:—

'I think the better class of farmers have adapted themselves to circumstances and have been in front of the times. I do not mean to say that this has been the case with all farmers, but I think all the leading farmers have done it.'

It must be remembered that Mr. Druce was a very friendly witness, and we do not think it could be maintained, that the enterprise and research of the farmers have hitherto been such as to largely alter the old system of farming, which in the words of many a spokesman at agricultural dinners or market ordinaries 'has been good enough for our fathers, and is good enough for us.'

We are not writing an agricultural treatise, and disclaim either the power or desire to submit advice as to improvement of agriculture. But we may properly state generally two heads under which attempts might be made to seek outlets for enterprise and reform; modes of cultivation, and modes of distribution. In the production of corn our farmers have to compete under difficulties, we scarcely like to say disadvantages, with growers of corn all over the world. Grain grown on rich and  
in

in many cases virgin soil, and by cheap labour, is easily carried. And though we see many reasons for believing, that the competition of America will not continue to be so severe as it is now, yet farmers will never be able to hold the market of the United Kingdom as exclusively as was once the case. There would appear to be an opportunity for diverting some of the energy and capital expended in grain-production to other channels. On the other hand, we find first that there are many articles, not easily carried, and in the productions of which foreign competitors have no impregnable advantage, but which we import largely. Eggs, fruit, and vegetables do not probably exhaust the list. If we attempted to show in any detail how the production of these in the United Kingdom could be fostered, we are quite aware that an army of difficulties would be brought against us, social, climatic, and economic. We content ourselves by saying, that it was not by succumbing to any such difficulties, that Englishmen acquired their hold on the commerce of the world, and in spite of opposition still retain it.

The present methods of distribution are such that there is an abnormal, and we venture to urge an unnecessary, difference as regards many articles of agricultural produce, between the price paid to the producer and that charged to the consumer. The use of the middleman, and the good he does to the community, are beyond assail; but the multiplication of middlemen over a certain point is an evil. Mr. Druce 'cannot help thinking that if some of the middlemen were done away with, the producer would be benefited,' and so, we venture to add, would be the consumer. If we look at the retail price of vegetables in large towns, and the amount paid to the market-gardener, we cannot doubt that both the latter and his ultimate customer paid heavily for distribution; and it is satisfactory to see signs of practical efforts to overcome the difficulties by those best able to deal with them and most interested in doing it successfully. In this matter the inability of the State to aid is not so absolute as in many other phases of commerce. The development of means of communication is essentially a work in which the State can assist. The Commissioners took plenty of evidence on the subject, but dealt briefly and cautiously in their report with the question of transport of goods. They advocate the adoption of measures to permit of the free development of canals wherever they are likely to be useful, and to prevent their being controlled by railway companies; and they also recommend, that every facility should be afforded by Parliament for the construction of light railways or tramways in those parts of the country, which may be found to be insufficiently supplied with

with the means of communication, or which are susceptible of further development in this respect. What is the nature of the facilities contemplated is not quite clear, but nothing is said in reference to any State aid, either direct or by some such method as guarantee. At the same time it would seem as if there were something more in the minds of the Commissioners than a desire that the legislative efforts of the promoters of the light railway should be encouraged by Parliament; and looking to the value to the community of means of communication and transport, which may not necessarily be remunerative to their owners, we think that the recommendations of the Commissioners deserve more attention, than if they were only an abstract expression of opinion on something approaching a truism. But though the State can do something, and may be expected to do something, under the guidance of a bold if prudent Chancellor of the Exchequer, the classes and the societies interested can do more. And we should welcome any vigorous attempt to grapple with the difficulties which lead to the payment for vegetables by the inhabitants of great towns of something like six and eight times the cost of production, and which cause hundreds of tons of fruit to rot on the ground because they cannot be brought to market with any prospect of profit to the producer.

We have confined our observations on this head to the tenant-farmers of England. They have not been led away by the fallacious doctrines and mischievous teaching which have largely influenced their fellows in some other parts of the United Kingdom. Though the reductions made in rents have been large, we are inclined to think as large in England as elsewhere, these reductions have been made either voluntarily by the landlords, or under proper and not illegal pressure. Occupiers of land have struggled honestly to pay their rent and to fulfil the terms of contracts from which, when circumstances were in their favour, they derived no mean advantage. If unable to do so, they have abandoned the contract and made no attempt to secure benefits of occupancy on one hand without discharging its obligations on the other. Elsewhere, unhappily, this has not been the case. Forcible resistance to legal process has been inculcated as a duty in more than one part of the United Kingdom. The mere opinion that a law is wrong, has been held to be, and for this view there is, we regret to say, high encouragement given by a certain school of political teachers, a justification for refusing to obey it, and supporting the refusal by force. This is a most dangerous doctrine, dangerous not merely to the body politic, but to the classes and individuals

individuals who act upon it. If continued, it must largely impair that credit which is the very foundation-stone of British commerce and British trade. Forcible repudiation of legal obligations cannot be indulged in without producing a loss of confidence in business integrity which must be injurious. The need of maintaining law and order is, we are glad to recognize, fully understood by the present Ministers of the Crown. It is perhaps too much to hope, that those who foster lawlessness from mistaken notions of this or that asserted right, or from even worse motives, will come to see the dangers into which their dupes are led.

A few words, and a few words only, before we leave agriculture, on the subject of the labourers. Changes in economic conditions operate slowly. Neither prosperity nor adversity is quick to reach the lower classes of the community. Here 'Ultimus ardet Ucalegon,' not 'proximus,' whatever be the translation of 'ardet.' Just as it was long before any of the results of the upward progress of society were brought within the reach of the labourers, so they have been slow to suffer from the effects of recent depression. A return of the rate of money wages of ordinary agricultural labourers in 1870-1 and 1880-1, scheduled to the report of Lord Iddesleigh's Commission, shows an increase in the latter year of from one shilling a week to, in parts of Nottingham, six shillings a week. And other than money wages probably also increased. Not only were his wages high, but the necessities of life were more within the labourer's reach. Bread, clothing, fuel, education for his children, and locomotion where locomotion was necessary, were all more accessible in 1880 than previously. With the agricultural labourer, as with the artizan, wages grew with decreased price of provisions, and English labourers in 1880 were not only absolutely but comparatively better off, both than labourers of other nations and than their own forefathers. Lately the reaction has begun to operate on agricultural labourers, and their employment is less regular. The reduction has been consequent on the stubborn efforts made by farmers to lower the cost of production; and while temporary employment in 'haysel and harvest' is less certain and less remunerative, the permanent list has been largely cut down. The agricultural labourers must, like the rest of the nation, learn from adversity just as they were influenced by prosperity. If it is true, as is alleged by many employers of agricultural labourers capable of judging, that workmen do not do as much work as they did before the advent of good times, it is necessary that there should be a return to the habits which improvement of circumstances discouraged.

couraged. More work, not necessarily in time, but in quantity and quality, and less of alehouse. Less political and other discussions; more attention to labour. The lesson is a hard one for a class who have many hardships to endure, few prospects of escape from the groove in which their wheel of fortune runs, and who have had a briefer spell of fair times than any other. But men immediately above them in their own state of society are learning the same lesson, and the wiser friends of the labourer will preach no resistance to its influence.

As to the other classes of workmen a very similar set of considerations arise. During the period of inflation which reached its zenith shortly after the Franco-German war, the advance in the prosperity of the working classes, especially those concerned in the production of coal, iron, and steel, was very great indeed. Even in 1886 the opinion of Sir Lowthian Bell and Mr. Barrow, of the Barrow Steel Company, was that the workmen were advancing. 'Labour is increasing in value, and the labourer doing better than the capitalist.'\* During the last twelve months the number of men regularly employed, has, as in the case of agricultural labourers, materially decreased, and the less eligible workmen find it difficult to get even temporary work. But even so the 'rate of wages for time work† appears to be on the whole slightly higher than the average of the last twenty years,' and the condition of those in regular employment is by no means now a bad one in itself, and is certainly better than the condition of the same class in other countries. This is a state of affairs which neither the working men nor those who assume to lead them realize. Competition is now-a-days international, and there is a tendency to find the level, not of a country, but of the world, which exercises perpetual action on the affairs of the working classes. When times were good, working-men took full advantage of them to secure better conditions, not only of labour, but of life for themselves and their families. The Legislature's stereotyped rules were adopted by employers and employed acting in concert, and made possible by the circumstances of the moment. Occasionally there were efforts to do more, and to insist on conditions which could not be maintained. Sometimes these efforts were so pressed as to force a change in the circumstances from which they arose. Trade was driven away from certain centres, from the difficulty which capitalists found in getting labour except on prohibitive terms. New orders of a largely remunerative character were rejected only for this same reason, and the action of the men contributed

---

\* Final Report of Lord Iddesleigh's Commission, p. viii.

† Ibid. p. x.  
largely

largely to the loss of that work, which they are now anxious to regain. A proper movement was pushed too far. Freedom from undue pressure exercised not necessarily by the masters but by their managers, and the establishment of moderation in hours of work and other such conditions of labour, were objects at which it was praiseworthy to aim. The Legislature recognized and sanctioned the efforts made by Trades Unions and their supporters to attain them, and in doing so were bold in interference with freedom of contract. But it is a serious question, which cannot yet be solved, whether Trade Unions did not exceed limits warranted by circumstances. One thing is certain, that workmen are now face to face with a difficult series of questions. They say that their rate of living cannot be reduced. This probably means that, having contracted certain habits when times were good, they are loth to abandon them now. But they cannot resist the competition of the world. The exclusion of foreign labour cannot be enforced for a continuance, though the immigration of actually destitute persons can be prohibited, as in America. And British workmen find not only that the development of industries of which England once held the virtual monopoly is being vigorously pushed in other countries, but that foreigners are coming here in great numbers, who are only too ready to accept conditions of employment which they themselves reject with scorn. It behoves the working-men, as much as other classes, to realize the change of affairs, and to learn the lessons taught by depression as readily as they learned those taught by prosperity.

Their natural tendency to do this is not, we fear, encouraged by a certain school of economists who take upon themselves to offer advice. What is called the 'right to work' is asserted by men in high position who should know better. There is not and there cannot be any such right. In Great Britain there is established by a law, the intention of which is humane, a right to food. The whole real property of the country is pledged to prevent destitution; and no inhabitant of the realm need undergo the least risk of starvation. But that it is the duty of any public body, whether the State itself or a local authority, to provide work for any one claiming it, is a principle the adoption of which would inevitably produce general disaster. The report of the first Poor Law Commissioners in 1833, a volume which is far too little studied in the present day, is full of examples of the great evils caused by the partial adoption of such a principle. The independence, the energy, the morality, aye, and even the happiness of the working classes, were destroyed when it was in force. We by  
no

no means assert that there cannot be, and have not been, circumstances in which exceptional measures, in themselves not free from objection, are justifiable when the object is to meet a crisis which is purely temporary. But such expedients should be very rare; they usually do more harm than good. We will give very briefly a few examples of the evil done by them in a recent case. In 1886, in consequence of representations made to the Government in Ireland that there was some distress in certain Unions of that country, a system of liberal relief was authorized under conditions which would, it was hoped, secure sound administration. What was the result? Relief, given it is to be observed on a nominal test of work, was eagerly claimed and readily given to throngs of persons who were lured by it from other employment. In one Union in the west of Ireland there were relieved in the week, ended June 5, 1886, 7642 persons; in the following week, none. In another Union 6775 persons were relieved in the first-named week; and in the following, 79. In another Union 1824 persons were relieved out of a population of 1947; and in a fourth all relief to 1470 persons was stopped, for no other reason than that the death of a relative of the officer charged with the relief occurred at that time.\* We admit that there are causes which operate more strongly in Ireland than they do in this country. But any direct action of the State, with the view of providing employment to all who claimed it, would only aggravate the evils sought to be cured. Before we conclude, we propose to refer to the lines within which the State can properly and usefully interfere as regards trade depression; but it cannot be too strenuously urged or too often repeated, that it is no part of the duty of the public to provide work for those who themselves are unable to find it. And guarding and rejoicing in the theory as regards the value of British labour held by many large employers, from Mr. Brassey downwards—namely that the highly paid British workman is cheaper than his less highly paid foreign competitor, even when he works for shorter hours, we assert, that it is very important for the friends of working men to understand the change of circumstances which has taken place since 1878, and not to insist on privileges or demand conditions, warranted perhaps then, but only to be attained now at the risk of loss of trade.

The increasing severity of foreign competition is more appreciated than it was when Lord Idedesleigh's commission reported. Every fresh discovery, which diminishes the cost of

---

\* Poor Relief Ireland Inquiry Commission, 1887.



transport or adds to the facilities of locomotion, augments that competition; and it is becoming more and more difficult for us 'to maintain to the same effect as heretofore the lead which we formerly held among the manufacturing nations of the world.' With some of the efforts in vogue to meet that competition we have already expressed our dissatisfaction. Short measures and shoddy are not likely to maintain or restore the supremacy of British Trade. Cheapness is desirable. But cheapness at the expense of excellence is not. Temporary profit may follow the sale of goods, the sole advantage of which is that they are not costly. But the reputation for excellence once enjoyed by British manufactures cannot be further tampered with. Much has, we fear, already been done to damage it, and more steps in the same direction should be sternly checked. 'We have still,' say the commissioners, 'the same physical and intellectual qualities which gave us a commanding lead; and we see no reason why, with care, intelligence, enterprise, and thoroughness, we should not be able to continue to advance.' But if we abandon those qualities, or indeed if we cease to develop them, the inexorable laws of morality and of economy will unquestionably operate to our disadvantage.

More activity must be displayed, the Commissioners think, in search for new markets. Herein the State can be of use. The reports of the diplomatic and consular officers abroad are useful, as far as they go. But though we fully admit the importance of keeping such officers absolutely free from direct or indirect connection with particular commercial operations, we think that more might be done than is done to collect and diffuse information, statistical or other, which could not fail to be of use to traders. In this country steps in this direction have been taken. The journal of the Board of Trade, and the publications of the Labour Correspondent of that Department, are intended to supply a want long felt. If representatives of this country were enabled to supplement their own opportunities for procuring and publishing information, more facts useful to traders might be brought to light. Co-operation between the State and the Great Trading Bodies of the United Kingdom, with this object, would be of use; and the latter must understand, that what has sufficed for the past will be inadequate for the years to come.

The need for extension of technical and commercial education is admitted. It is, we rejoice to see, one of the tasks undertaken by a Cabinet inclined rather to useful than heroic legislation. The German clerk competes with the English clerk, with many advantages in his favour. He has knowledge of foreign languages

guages to which the English clerk rarely attains. He looks upon his employment as a means to an end. He is seeking a training and a knowledge which will hereafter enable him to trade for himself, and with this object he faces privation, poverty, life among strangers, and onerous conditions as to hours of labour and remuneration. Too often the English clerk looks to promotion in his employer's service as the only object of his ambition. He is living at home, and under temptations to live up to his income, from which his foreign colleague is more or less free. In natural intelligence, in mental quickness and grasp, he is at any rate not worse than, and is, as a rule, superior to, the foreigner. But the luxury of good times has influenced him; no such national difficulties as those which have largely affected the whole German nation have touched him; and he has less of the hardness, the patience, and the endurance, which make his foreign fellows so formidable.

With the social habits and tendencies of any class, the State can have little influence. No Government department can persuade men to unlearn the lessons or abandon the pursuits, arising from a burst of prosperity which was more brilliant than permanent. If billiards and cards are more popular than chess, the music hall and the theatre more thronged than the debating-room or the evening school, and sensation novels and sporting papers more read than political history or foreign grammar, it is from causes outside the domain of direct State interference. What can be done is to place at the disposal of all those who are inclined to seek it a means of cheap commercial and technical training available, not only for boys at the threshold of their career, but those also who have made some advance in the practical knowledge of an office. Until English clerks are willing to undergo months, if not years, of drudgery in a foreign house of business, as German clerks are now, they must expect to be underbidden in their offers of service. But what the State can foster and extend is the ability which supplements the foreign willingness, but being without which English clerks have little encouragement to change their views of duty or their ambition of life. In this we are not bound to consider the relative values of a classical and a modern curriculum. We can unhesitatingly admit, for the purposes of higher education, the value of the former. We can agree in the estimate so often and so ably put forward, of the use of a classical training in the formation of mind and character. We can reject the censures so often heaped upon the practice of Greek and Latin verse-making, or the study of Virgil, Homer, or Sophocles. And at the same time we can assert as fully as the

most ardent modernist, the desirability of the wider establishment of schools or colleges, in which the acquirement of a knowledge of modern languages, commercial geography, and some understanding of the trade requirements of the countries connected with Great Britain by commercial ties, would be within the reach of the boy of fourteen, and the clerk who during the day is plodding at a merchant's desk.

The middle classes in England have certainly thriven during the last half-century, and their progress is probably less checked than that of others. Writing in 1846, an economist of some ability gave as instance the improvement in dwellings.\*

'It is not necessary to go back much beyond the half-century to arrive at a time when prosperous shopkeepers in the leading thoroughfares of London were without that necessary article of furniture, a carpet, in their ordinary sitting-rooms; luxury in this particular seldom went further with them than a well-scoured floor strewn with sand, and the furniture of the apartments was by no means inconsistent with this primitive and as we should now say comfortless state of things. In the same houses we now see not merely carpets, but many articles of furniture which were formerly in use only among the nobility and gentry.'

The dwellings of the prosperous shopkeepers in the leading thoroughfares of London, have advanced as far beyond the state referred to by Mr. Porter, as the condition he described was in advance of sanded floors. The very name of shopkeepers would probably be rejected by the principal purveyors of the leading thoroughfares of London, the majority of whom have their suburban residences, and are possessors of considerable wealth. So great indeed grew the profits of retail trade for several decades, that a reaction in the interest of the consumers was produced, and the co-operative system was established, with the object, and the result, of reducing the cost of distribution, and diminishing the number of middle men. The depression of trade has, of course, had its influence on retail traders. But not as yet to the extent to which it has affected the other classes to which we have alluded. At present its tendency has been to increase the value and power of huge emporia, and to encourage what is known as 'stores' in place of smaller establishments. But the influence of the giant retailers is not likely to grow too great, if the smaller merchants will only learn the lessons of care, thoroughness, and honesty, of which depression is a useful, if a hard teacher.

National prosperity has had its influence on classes other than those connected with trade. Foreign and international

---

\* 'Progress of the Nation,' by G. R. Porter, F.R.S. London, John Murray.  
difficulties

difficulties tend to the consolidation of national sentiment and national aims, just as domestic trials weld families. And the more or less unbroken period of peace which the United Kingdom has enjoyed has had the opposite tendency, of permitting minor points of internal difference to assume abnormal proportions. One result has been that more attention is paid to what are called 'rights' of persons or classes than is paid to obligations. One broad characteristic runs through all the speeches made to associations and assemblies of whatever kind. Far more is said to them of what they may expect to obtain by asking, than of what it is their duty to their country to do. There are those political teachers, and great is their responsibility, who lose no opportunity of promoting an antagonism between class and class, which is as repugnant to our national character as it is dangerous to our national welfare. Such men, statesmen many of them, do not hesitate to assume a jealousy and an opposition between this and that 'interest,' which we believe to be, if existent at all, inconsiderable in magnitude or effect. Some of them go so far as to foster rivalry between one portion of the kingdom and another, to urge the extraordinary view, that the affairs of the West or North are so different from those of the East or South, that the general assembly of the United Kingdom is incapable of dealing fairly and effectually with all of them. Disintegration, in its most dangerous form, is the only logical outcome of such a contention. But we are not now referring to such advisers. We are thinking rather of those perfectly well-intentioned and comparatively fair-minded speakers who habitually say to their audiences, try to get this, that, or the other, for yourselves. The lesson, get, is continually inculcated; and there has been no external pressure to teach the lesson—do. This leads to a public selfishness detrimental to the true interests of the country. As yet whenever there is any event calling for combined national action, that action is forthcoming. But a power disused is apt to grow weak, and those who are urging Englishmen to split themselves up into sections are running the risk of destroying that unity on which our Empire mainly rests.

In times of difficulty men instinctively seek a leader. In times of ease each man is apt to be a law unto himself. Consequently prosperity weakens authority. And there is nowadays a tendency to reject authority which is capable of much harm. That love of order and respect for authority are really inherent in the English people, foreigners saw with astonishment and admiration on the nights of the jubilee rejoicings, when enormous masses of sightseers were guided and controlled

as much by that respect as by the efforts of a few isolated policemen. But there is far too much of the mischievous teaching, that it is the privilege of free men to disobey any law of which they may happen to disapprove. In opposition to the greatest of all Teachers, men are told that it is their duty to defy the powers that be, when those powers press for the performance of an obligation opposed to their individual wishes. This is not only the case in Ireland, where men prate about martyrdom while they run away from the police. In other parts of the United Kingdom the same rebellious spirit, honoured too often with such epithets as gallant and plucky, is shown. Nor is the tendency confined to a class. The Church itself is not exempt from its influence, and 'Conscience' is appealed to in justification of resistance to the perfectly constitutional mandates of authority. Even when laws were the creation of a few, there was no such justification. In these days, when responsibility for legislation and the power of statute making are shared by the masses, there is no sort of excuse for the doctrine, that a change in the law can only be brought within the range of practical politics by some criminal resistance to its sanction. To the difficulty of maintaining law nothing adds so much as vacillation. Law-breakers are bad persons to run away from. And opposition to law, if firmly and patiently met, is certain to collapse. One great element of strength in the present Administration lies in their appreciation of this principle, and their resoluteness in acting up to it. Persistence in their policy in this respect will do much to annul the dangers arising from a state of feeling greatly encouraged by habitual prosperity, and which it is to be earnestly hoped that no period of national difficulty will be necessary to curtail.

The knowledge of dangers is the first step to their avoidance. It is with no dread that England is becoming effete, or worn out, or weak, that we have uttered a few words of caution. In some respects prosperity has caused us to wax fat. But there are no signs whatever as yet of national decay. It is foolish to bury our heads in the sand, and refuse to look at the evils which persistence in certain habits and tendencies is likely to produce. It is equally foolish to assert, that all is as it should be, and for ever to heap rosy-coloured praise on this or that characteristic. But while we still have the physical, intellectual, and, we may add, civic qualities to which we owe our lead, and we agree with Lord Iddesleigh's Commissioners that these remain, there is no reason why our National position, not only in commerce but in all other matters affecting our welfare, should not be maintained and raised to even still greater eminence.

ART.

ART. IV.—*Early Adventures in Persia, Susiana, and Babylonia, including a Residence among the Bakhtiyari and other Wild Tribes before the Discovery of Nineveh.* By Sir Henry Layard, G.C.B., author of 'Nineveh and its Remains,' &c.; Gold Medallist of the Royal Geographical Society. In Two Volumes. With Maps and Illustrations. London. 1887.

NO social event is pleasanter than an unexpected meeting with an old friend from whom we have long been separated. And the rencounter becomes doubly delightful, if we find him in a reminiscent mood, and full of entertaining chat about the early days of our acquaintance and his own antecedent history. Such is the mood in which we find Sir Henry Layard. It is now just forty years since he took the world by storm with the romantic tale of discovery and adventure on which his literary fame will ultimately rest. In the two volumes before us the veteran traveller describes the circumstances which originally directed his attention to the ruins of Nineveh, and prepared him for the great work of discovery with which his name is inseparably associated. These circumstances were recorded in a rough Journal, which Sir Henry contrived to keep, with varying regularity and method, amid the strange vicissitudes of his early travel. At the request of a friend, the Journal is now submitted to the public in the form of a continuous but unstudied narrative. No attempt has been made to enrich the pages with elaborate passages of moral reflection or descriptive art; but what the story thus loses in literary finish, it gains in lucidity and straightforward vigour.

It appears that much of Sir Henry Layard's boyhood was passed in Italy, and there, in the society of accomplished men who had seen the world, he imbibed a love of travel. At the age of twenty-two he determined to seek his fortunes in Ceylon, and he agreed to make the journey thither in company with a friend, Mr. Edward Ledwich Mitford, who was bound on a similar errand.

Now it chanced that Mr. Mitford had a horror of sea-sickness, and this circumstance determined our travellers to make the journey as far as possible by land. An epic poet or a philosophical historian, deducing great events from trivial origins, would love to trace the dramatic sequence of cause and effect which, in the long process of time, evolved the investigation of Nineveh, and the diplomatic career of its discoverer, from the incurable unwillingness of his early companion to face the miseries of *mal de mer*.

The

The scheme of travel undertaken by Mr. Layard and his friend was, considering the time and circumstances, as well as their own youth and inexperience, adventurous and even perilous in a high degree; but to the love of adventure and carelessness of peril, which are the birthright of youth, Mr. Layard superadded a prescient eye for future difficulties, and an intelligent prudence in preparing to meet them, which stamped him a born traveller. It was agreed to proceed through Central Europe, Dalmatia, Montenegro, Albania, and Bulgaria to Constantinople; thence to cross Asia Minor to Syria and Palestine, and the Mesopotamian desert to Baghdad. From Baghdad it was proposed to reach India through Persia and Afghanistan, and ultimately Colombo. Thus the entire journey, except across the narrow strait of Adam's Bridge, would be made by land. Mr. Layard first sought an introduction to Sir John MacNeill, who had recently been English Minister at Teheran, and by his advice determined to travel in the outward guise and style of a poor man, so as to avoid exciting the cupidity of the wild populations whom he must encounter. Mr. Layard's next step was to seek precise instructions as to the best available route from the Council of the Royal Geographical Society, who suggested some alterations of plan, and recommended a paper on Susiana, recently published by Sir Henry, then Major, Rawlinson, as a *vade mecum* and text-book of the country which it was proposed to explore.

Mr. Layard's next care was to take lessons in the use of the sextant, and to learn the method of taking observations of the sun for latitude, and of fixing the position of mountain peaks and other physical objects. He also studied, at University Hospital, the symptoms and treatment of intermittent fever, ophthalmia, and dysentery, and learned the use of the lancet and the tourniquet, and the method of treating simple wounds. The equipment of the travellers consisted solely of what they could carry in their saddle-bags. Mr. Layard carried a 'Levinge-bed,' i.e. a pair of sheets sewn together, and fastened to a mosquito-curtain; a long cloth riding-cloak; a double-barrelled gun; a sextant, a compass, a telescope, a thermometer, a barometer; a silver watch painted black to elude the cupidity of the natives; and a letter of credit for 300*l.* from Messrs. Coutts. Thus equipped, on the 8th of July 1839, he left England for Brussels, where he was joined by Mr. Mitford, who, true to himself, had preferred the shorter passage by Calais. A narrative of the earlier part of the journey has already been published by Mr. Mitford, and Sir Henry Layard declines to retrace the ground thus covered. He briefly mentions a

serious



serious attack of malarial fever which prostrated him at Constantinople, and for which he was treated by 'Dr. Z., an Armenian gentleman who had studied medicine at Edinburgh.' When we read that Dr. Z. not only bled his patient twice copiously, but also 'made a large circle with a pen and ink on his stomach, which he ordered to be filled with leeches,' we can only hope, in the interests of our travelling countrymen, that 'Dr. Z.' has long since retired from practice, and that the remedies for fever, recommended by the medical schools of Armenia and Edinburgh, have been rendered rather less stringent by the advance of science.

On the 9th of January, 1840, the travellers reached Jerusalem, and here their rambles and their lives were nearly terminated by their incaution in sleeping with a charcoal brazier burning in the room. Escaping from this peril, Mr. Layard, whose thirst for danger seems to have been insatiable, resolved, in spite of the most solemn warnings, to approach Damascus by the desert and the Hauran, instead of by the usual route, pausing on the way to visit Petra and the ruins of ancient cities to the east of the Jordan. Mr. Layard was warned that the sheikhs of the Arab tribes, through whose territory he would have to pass, were notorious for their rapacity and lawlessness, recognized no authority, and were generally at war with one another. The prospect, therefore, of being murdered, or at least robbed of everything and stripped to the skin, was by no means remote.

These gloomy vaticinations produced their natural effect on the more sensitive temperament of Mr. Mitford, who determined to spend a few more days in Jerusalem, and then, taking the usual caravan route to Damascus, to await his travelling companion's arrival at that city. Accompanied, therefore, only by an Arab boy called 'Antonio,' who acted as dragoman and servant, Mr. Layard left Jerusalem for Petra on the 15th of January, 1840. He made his first pause at Bethlehem, for the purpose of visiting the Church and Convent of the Holy Nativity, and thence proceeded to Hebron, where he visited the traditional tombs of Abraham and the patriarchs. At Hebron a hospitable colonel in the Egyptian Army—Usuf Effendi—strongly dissuaded him from attempting his projected journey to Petra, but, finding him obstinately bent on fulfilling his design, obligingly entered into a negotiation with the Sheikh of an Arab tribe with a view to the safe-conduct of the daring traveller.

After extortionate proposals and much bargaining, this Sheikh undertook to provide two camels to take Mr. Layard to Kerak,  
to

to the east of the Dead Sea, and to send his own brother as a guide. On the completion of the journey, the guide was to return with a written declaration for the *Mujeli*, or hereditary Chief of Kerak, that the traveller had arrived safe and sound. For these services the Sheikh was to receive five hundred piastres. Next morning Mr. Layard set forth on one of the hired camels, the other carrying his servant, tent, and baggage, and the camel-driver following on foot. The Sheikh did not appear, but promised to join the party on the road. Now began an unparalleled chapter of misfortunes. In the first place, the camel-driver did not know the road, and the travellers lost their way, wandering for hours over the barren and stony hills. Then Mr. Layard's camel bolted, and, when its rider tugged at the halter, 'only turned its head round, and looked me full in the face, without stopping or even slackening its speed.' Then the rider fell off over the animal's tail, and the camel ran away, and was with difficulty recaptured. Towards sunset, in a stony valley lying E.S.E. of Hebron, and running in the direction of the Dead Sea, Mr. Layard discovered the encampment which he was seeking. The Sheikh had not arrived, but the traveller was hospitably entertained. A sheep was killed, and a 'great mess of rice and boiled mutton was brought to the tent. The Sheikh's brother and his friends ate with me, dipping their fingers into the large wooden bowl, and picking out the savoury bits, which they presented to me.'

This unpalatable repast was followed by a chilly night, rendered sleepless by jackals and tooth-ache. The Sheikh in the meantime had arrived, and proffered the services of an Arab dentist attached to the camp. What followed must be told in Mr. Layard's own words:—

'His instruments consisted of a short knife, or razor, and a kind of iron awl. He bade me sit on the ground, and then took my head firmly between his knees. After cutting away the gums he applied the awl to the roots of the tooth; and, striking the other end of it with all his might, expected to see the tooth fly into the air. But it was a double one, and not to be removed by such means from the jaw. The awl slipped and made a severe wound in my palate. He insisted upon a second trial, declaring that he could not but succeed. But the only result was that he broke off a large piece of the tooth, and I had suffered sufficient agony to decline a third experiment.'

We fear that it is impossible to credit the Sheikh with the hospitable instincts which are supposed to be characteristic of his race, for, seeing his guest prostrate with the pain of this rugged dentistry, he seized the opportunity to raise his terms, and demanded additional payment for the safe-conduct which he

he had guaranteed. This, however, was refused, and Mr. Layard went forward with his difficult but most interesting journey through the desolate and mountainous region of the Dead Sea. After encountering perils of various kinds, including attacks of robbers, shortness of provisions, and difficulty of obtaining water, Mr. Layard arrived in safety at the *Wady Musa*, or Valley of Moses, where after an hour-and-a-half of wandering amid the elaborate excavations which have rendered the district famous, and a threatening encounter with a tribe of savage Arabs, he found himself at Petra.

The scenery which surrounds Petra seems to have deeply impressed our traveller with its desolation, its solemnity, and the fantastic aspect of its geological formation. But his description of the city itself will be read with disappointment by those whose imaginations of Petra and its romantic beauty have been such as the poet embodied in the famous challenge:—

‘Match me such marvel, save in Eastern clime,  
A rose-red city half as old as time.’

Leaving Petra, Mr. Layard retraced his steps in the direction of the Dead Sea, fraternizing with a tribe of Arabs who were encamped near the foot of the high Land of Moab. Here the gastronomical experiences (which fill a large space in the narrative) were of a peculiarly trying kind. Half a boiled sheep, accompanied by a concoction of camel's milk, flour, rancid butter and unleavened bread, formed the repast: ‘The men made balls of this mess with their dirty hands, and then presented them to me to eat—a mode of showing attention to a guest which would not be altogether agreeable to a person choice as to his food.’

However as Mr. Layard and his companions had lived for some days on rice and unleavened bread, it is to be presumed that they were in no critical or dainty humour, and their camels which, during a like period, had subsisted on ‘an occasional tuft of camel-thorn, and a low bush bearing a yellowish berry,’ must have been even more sharp-set. ‘They were now supplied with some chopped straw,’ a diet which must have made them extremely thankful for their drivers' concession, that ‘although they could go for two or even three days without water, they ought to drink once in every twenty-four hours.’

Leaving the Dead Sea (which he found to be fully as buoyant as has been represented by other travellers), Mr. Layard fell into the clutches of a tribe of mountain robbers, who stripped him of all his possessions, and were only restrained from more desperate

desperate violence by the skill with which the traveller handled his double-barrelled gun. Later on, by the good offices of a friendly chieftain, the bulk of the property was recovered, though a shirt had been cut up into three to clothe some naked children, and a pair of trousers had been ingeniously converted into a jacket.

A young Arab, who had robbed the saddle-bags, was brought to Mr. Layard in an abdominal agony, caused by having drunk a preparation of creosote in mistake for brandy. Observing that this was no doubt the punishment assigned by Allah for an act of dishonesty, Mr. Layard administered an emetic, which gave the desired relief. He thus confirmed, by physical signs, a popular belief in his supernatural authority, which subsequently stood him in good stead.

A laborious but not specially eventful journey conducted Mr. Layard to the ruins of Ammon, where he notes a Corinthian temple, with its façade almost entire; a Composite temple, with ten fine columns, cornice, pediment, and ornamental sculpture; a theatre, partly cut out of the side of the cliff, with its three tiers of seats, its proscenium, and the tribune of the Roman governor, still distinctly marked; and many other architectural fragments, almost unique in historical and archæological interest.

Leaving Ammon, Mr. Layard found himself at last in a country to some extent cultivated, but populated by tribes no less rapacious and violent than those whom he had encountered in the Desert. An even more disagreeable incident was the appearance of the plague in the encampment where he was reposing. It soon transpired that the fell disease was rampant in the district, and, as the villagers believed that all Englishmen were naturally physicians, they brought all their plague-stricken relatives to Mr. Layard, for advice and treatment. It was obviously impossible to stay longer in the midst of these flattering but inconvenient tributes to European skill. Yet the way of escape was barred; for, owing to the existence of the plague, no one was allowed to enter from the East the neighbouring Pashalic of Damascus, and a vigorous quarantine was maintained by armed patrols, who punished with death any attempt to cross the border.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Layard, anxious to rejoin his friend Mr. Mitford, who, as he believed, was awaiting him at Damascus, resolved to turn southwards, and to make his way across the Jordan to Tiberias. In this endeavour he was aided by the good offices of a Bashi-Bozuk; and, in gratitude to his helper, he records his emphatic dissent from the impassioned rhetoric

rhetoric which, in the political controversies of ten years since, made the name of Bashi-Bozuk a synonym for cruelty and violence. 'I often experienced from these irregular troopers, recruited from all parts and races, of the Ottoman Empire, much kindness and help, and found in them amusing and jovial companions.'

After parting with the Bashi-Bozuk, Mr. Layard entered the valley of the Jordan. Here, amid cultivated lands and increasing signs of civilization, the traveller journeyed on till he crossed the sacred river, about five miles from its outlet in the Lake of Tiberias. Next morning he sighted the Sea of Galilee, and a little later arrived at Tiberias. The town was still a mass of ruins, the results of the earthquake of New Year's Day, 1837; but a Polish Jew provided accommodation in a wooden hut, and our traveller slept at last in a clean European bed. On his journey from Tiberias towards Damascus, Mr. Layard was again waylaid and robbed—this time by some deserters from the Egyptian army, who stripped him of everything except his trousers and shirt. Nothing daunted by this disaster, nor by the total exhaustion of his purse, Mr. Layard continued his journey on foot, and, aided by an Arab guide, tramped towards Damascus under cover of the night, and, thereby eluding the quarantine, at last made his way safely into the city. Foot-sore, weary, penniless, half-naked, three parts starved, Mr. Layard made his first entry into Damascus in 1839. Forty years later, he re-entered it as English Ambassador to the Sultan, and was received with demonstrations of public welcome and honour, such as had never been accorded to a European of whatever rank in the Turkish dominions. It is a contrast which might move an ordinary writer to pardonable self-glorification, but Sir Henry Layard dismisses it with brevity and modesty. Nor less commendable is his reticence with regard to the outward aspect of Damascus, with its squalid thoroughfares, its brilliant bazaars, and its palaces of romantic splendour. All this has been described by countless pens, and Sir Henry Layard passes it by with slight but sufficient notice. He bestows, however, some space and some pains in describing a singular ebullition of fanatical fury which broke out during his stay, on account of the mysterious disappearance of an Italian friar; supposed, in accordance with a disgusting libel immemorially current in the East, to have been murdered by the Jews for the sake of his blood, to be used in making Passover cakes. The cruelties which, in consequence of this delusion, were inflicted at this time on the Jewish inhabitants of Damascus, brought Sir Moses Montefiore to the rescue of his persecuted

secuted fellow-religionists. The whole incident, as narrated by Sir Henry Layard, deserves careful attention, as illustrating the inveterate survival of medieval passions, even in the middle of the nineteenth century.

At Damascus Mr. Layard had personal experience of Arab surgery, as he had had previously of Bedouin dentistry :—

‘When I arrived at Damascus I was suffering excruciating pain from a whitlow under one of my thumb-nails. Not knowing where to go to obtain relief, I entered a barber’s shop in the bazaar, thinking that the owner probably followed the trade of surgery as well as his own, like his brethren in other parts of the world. I showed him my thumb. He was a tall, muscular fellow, and grasped it with a grip of iron. He then took a sharp instrument, and, inserting it under the nail, drove it into the sore. In vain I struggled and howled, as the agony I experienced was intense. He held me as if I had been an infant, until he had pressed the matter out of the opened whitlow. He then allowed me to withdraw my hand, and turned with a look of satisfaction to the little crowd which had gathered round his shop to witness the operation. I went to him daily to have my finger dressed with an ointment which he prepared. The cure was complete, but the method, to say the least of it, was somewhat brutal, and I vowed that, after my experience of Arab dentistry and surgery, I would not again trust myself to a Bedouin to draw a tooth, or to a Damascus barber to cure a whitlow.’

From Damascus our traveller journeyed to Baalbek, where he found the colossal ruins as yet untouched by the devastating hand of the English and American tourists, who since that time have inflicted irreparable injury on the architectural ornaments of the Temple.

From Baalbek the route lay by Beyrout and Tripoli to Aleppo. At the mouth of the Nahr-el-Kelb Mr. Layard paused to examine the rock-hewn sculptures and inscriptions, which at that time were supposed to be Phœnician, but which his subsequent discoveries at Nineveh proved to be of Assyrian origin.

At Aleppo he found Mr. Mitford, whom he had missed at Damascus. On the 18th of March the friends left Aleppo together, and reached Baghdad on the 2nd of May. It was at this time that Mr. Layard first visited the ruins of Nimroud, and formed the design of those excavations which he afterwards carried out with such memorable success.

On leaving Baghdad, Mr. Layard found himself at the beginning of the most difficult and dangerous part of his long enterprise. He must now traverse Persia, and the almost unknown region between that country and Hindostan. During two months’

months' residence at Baghdad, he had been acquiring the Persian language, and he now assumed the Persian dress.

On the 30th of June, Mr. Layard and Mr. Mitford left Baghdad, with one of the caravans which constantly pass between that city and the interior of Persia. The first stages of the journey lay through a district forming part of the vast alluvial plains which stretch from the Persian mountains to the Euphrates, and, beyond, to the great Syrian desert. Much that was archeologically interesting was encountered on the road, and, arriving at Kermanshah, the travellers halted for the first time at a Persian town. Sir Henry Layard does not omit to mention that, after a long-continued diet of boiled sheep and rancid butter, the delicacies of Persian cookery were doubly acceptable.

In other respects, our travellers' first experience of Persia was not so agreeable. The moment was to some extent an unfavourable one for English visitors. England had just suspended her diplomatic relations with the Court of Teheran, had withdrawn her ambassador, Sir John MacNeill, and had occupied the island of Karak in the Persian Gulf. Actual hostilities were considered to be imminent, and the Persian populace was ill-disposed towards Christian strangers. Mr. Layard and his companion experienced some incivility, and found it very difficult to persuade the authorities that the motive of their journey was harmless and non-political. It appeared that their best course would be to obtain the personal permission of the Shah, if they were to continue their journey unmolested, and with this view they set out towards a town called Kangowar, where the Shah was at that time encamped.

They reached the village of Sabaunah on the 8th of July, exactly one year from the day of departure from England, and he records that the anniversary found him in high spirits, greatly enjoying his adventures, ready to face any perils and privations, and in excellent health, only broken by occasional bouts of intermittent fever.

For some days Mr. Layard and his companion remained as visitors in the Shah's camp, following its movements from place to place, and enquiring in vain for the promised permission to travel unmolested. In the tedious and irritating negotiations which he was forced to conduct before he could secure his end, Mr. Layard had occasion to form the worst opinion of the Persian officials, especially of the Prime Minister, who had been the Shah's tutor, and of His Majesty's late ambassador to London, who, as a punishment for certain peculations, had recently been so soundly bastinadoed that he 'lost the nails



nails of his toes, and also his royal master's favour.' It is to be hoped that, after fifty years of civilization, the Diplomatic Service of Persia is administered on less rigorous principles.

On the 8th of August Mr. Layard and Mr. Mitford received 'Firmans,' permitting them to continue their journey without let or hindrance, and at the public expense. A 'Mehmandar,' or kind of official courier, was told off to accompany Mr. Layard. On the evening of that day the travellers parted. Mr. Mitford started on his long journey by the north of Persia to Kandahar. Mr. Layard, proposing to himself a similar destination, determined to reach it through the savage and turbulent district of the Seistan.

Unfortunately he soon found himself among half-civilized tribes, who declined to recognise the Shah's authority, or to yield obedience to his Firman, and thus, in spite of the Imperial safe-guard, the journey was troublesome and dangerous. Fever and dysentery added to the difficulties, and it was with a special sense of relief that Mr. Layard at length reached Isfahan. At this interesting city Mr. Layard had opportunities of observing the Persian system of criminal jurisprudence, which was carried out with great severity by the Governor, Manchar Khan. In a tank in this gentleman's courtyard, a bundle of pomegranate switches was kept soaking, so as to be ready for use in the Bastinado. His attendants were styled 'Ferrashes,' literally 'sweepers,' a title of unpleasantly comprehensive import, as the sweeper's duties ranged from sweeping the rooms to administering the bastinado. Sir H. Layard narrates several instances of fiendish ingenuity in the invention of torture by which the Governor had won great administrative fame, and records his opinion that, at this time, no barbarous nation excelled the Persians in their shocking indifference to cruelty, alike in the case of human beings and of the lower animals.

On the 22nd of September, Mr. Layard left Isfahan, accompanied by Shefi'a Khan, a Bakhtiyari chief, and a small cavalcade of travellers. For the next two months he was a guest of certain friendly chiefs among the Bakhtiyari mountaineers, and, having been fortunate or skilful enough to cure a chief's eldest son of an intermittent fever, he established relations of the utmost cordiality with the youth's father. This part of the narrative may best be given in the author's own words:—

'My reputation as a Frank physician had preceded me, and I had scarcely arrived at the castle when I was surrounded by men and women asking for medicines. They were principally suffering from intermittent fevers, which prevail in all parts of the mountains during

during the autumn. Shortly afterwards the chief's principal wife sent to ask me to see her son, who, I was told, was dangerously ill, and I was taken to a large booth built of boughs of trees, in which she was living. It was spread with the finest carpets, and was spacious enough to contain a quantity of household effects heaped up in different parts of it. The lady sat unveiled in a corner watching over her child, a boy of ten years of age, and about her stood several young women, her attendants. She was a tall, graceful woman, still young and singularly handsome, dressed in the Persian fashion, with a quantity of hair falling in tresses down her back from under the purple silk kerchief bound round her forehead. As I entered, she rose to meet me, and I was at once captivated by her sweet and kindly expression. She welcomed me in the name of her husband to Kala Tul, and then described to me how her son had been ill for some time from fever, and how the two noted physicians whom I had seen in the lamerdoun had been sent for from a great distance to prescribe for him, but had failed to effect a cure. She entreated me, with tears, to save the boy, as he was her eldest son, and greatly beloved by his father. I found the child in a very weak state from a severe attack of intermittent fever. I had suffered so much myself during my wanderings from this malady that I had acquired some experience in its treatment. I promised the mother some medicine, and told her how it was to be administered. Returning to the castle I sent her some doses of quinine; but before giving them to the child she thought it expedient to consult the two physicians who had been summoned to Kala Tul. Fearing that if their patient passed into my hands they would lose the presents they expected, they advised that it would be dangerous to try my remedies. Their opinion was confirmed by a mulla, who, upon all such important occasions, was employed to consult the Koran in the usual way by opening the leaves at random. The oracle was unfavourable, and my medicine was put aside for the baths of melon juice and Shiraz wine, and the water with which the inside of a porcelain coffee-cup, on which a text from the Koran was written in ink, had been washed. The condition of the boy, however, became so alarming, that his father was sent for.

Soon afterwards the renowned chief arrived at the castle, surrounded by a crowd of horsemen. His manners and appearance are thus described :—

‘The cordial and unaffected manner in which these words were spoken made a very favourable impression upon me, which was confirmed by his frank and manly bearing and engaging expression. Mehemet Taki Khan was a man of about fifty years of age, of middle height, somewhat corpulent, and of a very commanding presence. His otherwise handsome countenance was disfigured by a wound received in war from an iron mace, which had broken the bridge of his nose. He had a sympathetic, pleasing voice, a most winning smile, and a merry laugh. He was in the dress which the Bakhtiyari

chiefs usually wore on a journey, or when on a raid or warlike expedition—a tight-fitting cloth tunic reaching to about the knees, over a long silk robe, the skirts of which were thrust into capacious trousers, fastened round the ankles by broad embroidered bands. Round his Lur skull-cap of felt was twisted the “lung,” or striped shawl. His arms consisted of a gun, with a barrel of the rarest Damascene work, and a stock beautifully inlaid with ivory and gold; a curved sword, or scimitar, of the finest Khorassan steel—its handle and sheath of silver and gold; a jewelled dagger of great price, and a long, highly ornamental pistol thrust in the “kesh-kemer,” or belt round his waist, to which were hung his powder-flasks, leather pouches for holding bullets, and various objects used for priming and loading his gun, all of the choicest description. The head and neck of his beautiful Arab mare were adorned with tassels of red silk and silver knobs. His saddle was also richly decorated, and under the girths was passed on one side a second sword, and on the other an iron inlaid mace, such as Persian horsemen use in battle. Mehemet Taki Khan was justly proud of his arms, which were renowned throughout Khuzistan. He had a very noble air, and was the very beau-ideal of a great feudal chief.’

As soon as the chief had entered the interior of the castle and heard of the serious illness of his son, he sent for the young Englishman.

‘I found him sobbing and in deep distress. His wife and her women were making that mournful wail which denotes that some great misfortune has happened or is impending. The child was believed to be at the point of death. The father appealed to me in heartrending terms, offering me gifts of horses and anything that I might desire if I would only save the life of his son. The skilful physicians, he said, for whom he had sent, had now declared that they could do nothing more for the boy, and his only hope was in me. I could not resist Mehemet Taki Khan’s entreaties, and after reminding him that the medicines I had already prescribed had not been given, I consented to do all in my power to save the child’s life, on condition that the native doctors were not allowed to interfere. Although he was willing to agree to all I required, he could not, as a good Musulman, allow the boy to take my remedies until the mulla, who resided in the castle and acted as secretary and chaplain to the chief, could consult the Koran and his beads. The omen was favourable, and I was authorized to administer my medicines, but they were to be mixed with water which had served to wash off from the cup a text from the Koran—a ceremony upon which the mulla insisted.

‘The child was in a high fever, which I hoped might yield to Dover’s powder and quinine. I administered a dose of the former at once, and prepared to pass the night in watching the effect. I was naturally in great anxiety as to the result. If the boy recovered, I had every reason to hope that I should secure the gratitude of his father, and be able to carry out my plan of visiting the ruins and monuments

monuments which were said to exist in the Bakhtiyari Mountains, and which it was the main object of my journey to reach. If, on the other hand, he were to die, his death would be laid at my door, and the consequences might prove very serious, as I should be accused by my rivals, the native physicians, of having poisoned the child. About midnight, to my great relief, he broke out into a violent perspiration, which all the remedies hitherto given him had failed to produce. On the following day he was better. I began to administer the quinine, and in a short time he was pronounced out of danger, and on the way to complete recovery.

'The gratitude of the father and mother knew no bounds, for the affection among these mountaineers for their children is very great. They insisted that I should in future live in the enderun, and a room was assigned to me. Mehemet Taki Khan made me accept a horse, as mine had not recovered from the effects of the journey over the mountains. But what I most needed was linen and clothes. These were supplied to me by his wife. I was indeed sadly in want of my second shirt. I had been compelled, after I had been robbed of it, to hide myself in the rushes on the bank of a stream to wash the one I wore, and to wait without it until it had dried by the sun. My Persian clothes, of European cotton print, were in the shabbiest condition, and beyond repair. The Khatun's women soon made for me all that I was in want of.'

From the mountainous country of the Bakhtiyari tribes, Mr. Layard made his way to the island of Karak, where he spent Christmas, but early in the new year returned to Kala Tul, the encampment among the mountains, where he had been so hospitably entertained. His description of domestic life among these wild hillsmen, of their intelligence, honesty, and patriotism, and of their love of poetry and music, will be found one of the most interesting passages of the whole work. We specially note the tribute which he pays to the chieftain's wife, as one of the gentlest and most skilful of sick nurses. We imagine that such an experience as this of Mr. Layard's, while not often paralleled since, was, at the time, absolutely unique, and he turned it to the utmost advantage by the aid of a keen insight into racial traits, a natural power of making himself at home in the most unsophisticated company, great accuracy of observation, and a most retentive memory.

The following passage strikes us as so graphic as to deserve reproduction in its entirety.

'I frequently witnessed whilst in Mehemet Taki Khan's camp the effect which poetry had upon men who knew no pity and who were ready to take human life upon the smallest provocation or for the lowest greed. It might be supposed that such men were insensible to all feelings and emotions except those excited by hatred of their

enemies, cupidity, or revenge. Yet they would stand until late in the night in a circle round Mehemet Taki Khan, as he sat on his carpet before a blazing fire which cast a lurid light upon their ferocious countenances—rather those of demons than of human beings—to listen with the utmost eagerness to Sheff'a Khan, who, seated by the side of the chief, would recite, with a loud voice and in a kind of chant, episodes from the "*Shah-Nameh*," describing the deeds of Rustem, the mythical Persian hero, or the loves of Khosrau and Shirin. Or sometimes one of those poets or minstrels who wandered from encampment to encampment among the tribes would sing, with quavering voice, the odes of Hafiz or Saadi, or improvise verses in honour of the great chieftain, relating how he had overcome his enemies in battle and in single combat, and had risen to be the head of the Bakhtiyari by his valour, his wisdom, his justice, and his charity to the poor. The excitement of these ruthless warriors knew no bounds. When the wonderful exploits of Rustem were described—how with one blow of his sword he cut horse and rider into two, or alone vanquished legions of enemies—their savage countenances became even more savage. They would shout and yell, draw their swords, and challenge imaginary foes. When the death of some favourite hero was the poet's theme, they would weep, beat their breasts, and utter a doleful wail, heaping curses upon the head of him who had caused it. But when they listened to the moving tale of the loves of Khosrau and his mistress, they would heave the deepest sighs—the tears running down their cheeks—and follow the verses with a running accompaniment of "*Wai! wai!*"

'Such was probably the effect of the Homeric ballads when recited or sung of old in the camps of the Greeks, or when they marched to combat. Such a scene as I have described must be witnessed to fully understand the effect of poetry upon a warlike and emotional race.

'Mehemet Taki Khan himself was as susceptible to it as his wild followers. I have seen him, when we were sitting together of an evening in the enderun at Kala Tul, cry and sob like a child as he recited or listened to some favourite verses. When I expressed to him my surprise that he, who had seen so much of war and bloodshed, and had himself slain so many enemies, should be thus moved to tears by poetry, he replied, "*Ya, Sahib! I cannot help it. They burn my heart!*"

After his return to the mountains, Mr. Layard was for several weeks an eye-witness, and in some sense a participator, of some warlike operations between the Bakhtiyari mountaineers and the armies of the Shah, who was endeavouring to reduce his wild feudatories to submission. This part of Mr. Layard's travels naturally abounds in incident, of which plague, pestilence, famine, and robbery, are trifling details, and narrow escapes from death by no means unfrequent features. About this time our traveller began to hear disquieting rumours of  
defeats

defeats sustained by the British troops, and massacres of Englishmen in Afghanistan. These accounts, though destined to be terribly verified, proved to be, for the moment, premature; but, being unable to ascertain the precise amount of credence to be attached to them, and doubting the prudence of an attempt to pass through the Seistan and approach India by Kandahar, Mr. Layard resolved to return to Baghdad. He had formed a plan of promoting a British trade with Khuzistan, and he conceived that Colonel Taylor, the British Resident of the East India Company at Baghdad, would be able to render valuable aid in this direction.

In the month of August, undeterred by blazing heat and drought, Mr. Layard set out on his journey across Miyandâb, with two Arab companions and a black slave. The Arabs, who professed to act as guides, did not know the route; the travellers lost their way in the dark; and the prospect of encountering lions and simooms, together with the actual experience of hunger and burning thirst, rendered this portion of the journey unusually trying. But a timely arrival at the river Kerkhah—identified by Sir H. Layard with the Choaspes—saved the travellers from utter collapse.

At Hawizah, Mr. Layard became acquainted with a Sabæan, or 'Christian of St. John,' whose goodwill he had earned by remonstrating with the 'Matamet,' or governor, against the persecution to which the Sabæans were subjected, on account of their faith, by the Mohammedans. We could wish that a little more space had been bestowed on the description of this ancient and interesting community. The Sabæans, who call themselves 'Mendaï,' or 'Mendaï Yaghia,' and are called by the Persians 'Sabi,' had been reduced by persecution to some three or four hundred families. This remnant, in spite of all efforts to pervert them, remained loyal to their faith, in spite of the most savage persecution.

'They were found in Shusta and Basra, and among the Arabs in the country watered by the Shat-el-Arab and the Karun, and their confluents. Wearing the dress and speaking the language of the Arabs, they could scarcely be distinguished from them. But they would not eat with them, nor partake of the flesh of any animal which had not been killed by one of themselves. The Sabæans have their sacred books, for which they claim a very high antiquity, speak a Semitic dialect, and have a written character of their own.'

In the next stage of his journey, Mr. Layard exchanged the trials of drought for those of flood, having, on account of the Kherkhah's unexpected change of course, to wade through morasses and to cross streams with the water up to the saddle-girths.

girths. The presence of lions in the immediate vicinity, and their visible footmarks, enhanced the sense of insecurity.

At Hawizah, Mr. Layard joined a considerable cavalcade, consisting of traders and pilgrims, and set out for Nashwar, a village upon the Shat-el-Arab, where he was received with a civilized courtesy and hospitality which, in his recent experiences, had been rather rare. Arriving at the Shat-el-Arab, he found an English merchantman, the 'Lord Elphinstone,' anchored in the river, and then 'for the first time for many months I could undress, and enjoy the pleasant sensation of sleeping between clean sheets. My bed had hitherto been my carpets on the bare ground.'

From the 'Lord Elphinstone,' Mr. Layard proceeded by boat to Basra, where a Mr. Barsac, an Armenian gentleman and agent for the East India Company, put him on his way to Baghdad. On this portion of his journey he was escorted by a couple of mongrel Arabs, of a tribe which acted as the letter carriers of Mesopotamia, but these attendants were of little service, as their nerves were so shattered that, in every gust of wind, they thought they discerned the approach of hostile Bedouins, and, under the shadow of every bush, a lurking lion. It is needless to say, that they offered no resistance to the attack of some Arab highwaymen who levied blackmail upon the travellers.

The disturbed condition of the country, where the Shammar tribe of Bedouins was at war with the Pasha of Baghdad, rendered it necessary to push forward with all despatch. Making, therefore, no stay at the site of Babylon, Mr. Layard advanced with all speed towards Baghdad, but not swiftly enough to avoid an encounter with a party of armed Shammars, who stripped him to the skin, and were only deterred from killing him by the friendly interposition of a young sheikh, who mistook him for Dr. Ross, of Baghdad. This Dr. Ross was highly popular with the Bedouin chiefs, on account of his kindness and liberality in rendering them medical aid, and he subsequently procured the restoration of Mr. Layard's property. Some years later, Mr. Layard again met the young chief who now saved his life, and he exclaimed: 'You are now my brother, but had I not remembered the English *hakim* of Baghdad when you fell into our hands, by Allah! you would have been put to death as an accursed Turk.' Having escaped by the skin of his teeth from violent death, barefooted, bareheaded, and three parts naked, Mr. Layard now plodded on foot towards Baghdad. He walked all night, feeling that if once day dawned, the fury of a Mesopotamian sun would finally overwhelm him. It is  
not



not difficult to imagine the sensations of relief with which, by the first gleam of sunrise, he saw the palm groves of the Tigris and the gates of Baghdad.

'We soon reached the river, and as it was necessary to cross it, the Agayl went in search of a boatman whom he knew. He shortly returned with a "keefa," a circular boat made of reeds overlaid with bitumen, the owner of which quickly ferried us to the opposite bank. We landed in a garden outside the city walls, and near one of the gates. It was still closed, and would not be opened till sunrise. I sank down on the ground, overcome with fatigue and pain. A crowd of men and women bringing the produce of their gardens, laden on donkeys, to the bazaars, were waiting for the moment when they were to be admitted. At length the sun rose and the gate was thrown open. Two cawasses of the English Residency, in their gold-embroidered uniforms, came out, driving before them with their courbashes the Arabs who were outside, to make room for a party of European ladies and gentlemen. It was the same party that, on my previous visit to Baghdad, I had almost daily accompanied on their morning rides. They passed close to me, but did not recognize me in the dirty Arab in rags crouched near the entrance; nor, clothed as I was, would I venture to make myself known to them. But a little distance behind them came Dr. Ross. I called to him, and he turned towards me in the utmost surprise, scarcely believing his senses when he saw me without cover to my bare head, with naked feet, and in my tattered "abba."

At this place Mr. Layard made a considerable stay, in order to restore at once his physical condition, to overhaul his equipments, and to communicate by letter with his friends in England. This last was a business of three months. It was some weeks before he could walk with comfort, as his bare feet had been terribly blistered and wounded by his walk across the desert. Until answer could be received from England, it was necessary to practise severe economy, but this was not difficult to a man who, since leaving home two years before on this adventurous journey, had spent in all less than two hundred pounds, including the various sums of which at different times he had been robbed, and which, as he naively says, 'came legitimately under the head of travelling expenses.\*' Early in October, Mr. Layard left Baghdad, on board the 'Assyria,' a small armed steamer belonging to the East India Company, intending to descend the Tigris from Baghdad to its junction with the Euphrates. Stopping at Korna, he inspected the traditional tomb of the prophet Ezra,

\* Mr. Layard and Mr. Milford calculated that their expenses whilst travelling together through Asia Minor and Syria amounted to about 1s. 6d. a day, and this included the keep of their horses!

a 'Holy Place' alike in the estimation of Mussulmans and Jews, but found no ancient remains, or other features of archeological interest. At Korna, the 'Assyria' entered the united streams of Tigris and Euphrates, together forming the estuary called Shat-el-Arab. This conducted them to Muhammera; and then, passing through the Hafar, which connects the Shat-el-Arab with the Karun, they ascended the latter river for purposes of exploration, but the lowness of the water, and the disturbed condition of the tribes on the bank, soon rendered it prudent to retrace their steps. Making a pause to inspect the magnificent ruins of the Palace of Chosroes, at Ctesiphon, the travellers returned to Baghdad, and, as some time must still elapse before his letters could arrive from England, Mr. Layard determined to employ his enforced leisure in exploring Susiana, and ascertaining, by the course of its rivers and its physical formation, its fitness for commercial purposes. On the last day of October he left Baghdad in the 'Assyria,' then bound for Basra. He quitted the vessel when they reached the encampments of Sheikh Mathkur, who provided him with horses and a guide for his journey to Dizful. The country was in a very disturbed state, and unusual precautions were necessary, in order to escape the clutches of hostile tribes, and to allay the suspicions of those who feared attack. To secure this latter end, Mr. Layard's native servant invented an ingenious theory. The kings of Feringhistan (or Europe), he said, send their subjects to travel in different countries, in order that they may enquire into the history of ancient monarchs, and inform themselves of their good and bad actions. They thus are able to regulate their own conduct, and to govern their own countries with justice and wisdom.

This ingenious fable was well received, and satisfied the curiosity of the native chiefs, as to Mr. Layard's motive in visiting ancient ruins and wandering through foreign lands.

The next few stages of the journey were agreeably diversified by the usual incidents of treacherous guides, murderous robbers, and disappointments resulting from Arab fictions about interesting monuments which did not exist; but eventually Mr. Layard made his way to the mountain fortress of Jaffer Kuli Khan, the principal chief of the Bakhtiyari tribe of Haft Lang. Here, rather contrary to his own expectations, he was most hospitably received, and was permitted to investigate the curious combination of artificial precautions with natural advantages, which rendered the chief's castle practically impregnable. From these fastnesses, Mr. Layard made his way over a series of difficult and dangerous mountain passes,

to

to certain ruins believed by Sir Henry Rawlinson to be remains of one of the great fire-temples of ancient Elymäis. They were known to the Bakhtiyari as the Musjedi-Suleiman Bozurg, or the Temple of the great Solomon. Tradition alleged that Solomon had held his court there, when he went to war with Rustem, Ali, and the heroes of antiquity. And there his treasures were still concealed beneath the ruins, assiduously guarded by cohorts of evil spirits. But here again our traveller was doomed to disappointment, finding the reality tame and uninteresting after the highly-coloured description of the native guides. He is persuaded that Sir H. Rawlinson had been similarly deceived.

After this unsuccessful enterprise, Mr. Layard returned, on the 1st of December, to Shuster, which he had quitted in the previous summer. Here he found the Bakhtiyari chieftain and chieftainess, Mehemet Taki Khan and Khatun-Jan, who had entertained him so hospitably in their mountain home, overmastered by the Persian Government, ruined, and imprisoned.

From Shuster Mr. Layard sets out in company with Seyyid Abou 'l-Hassan, a descendant of the Prophet, who combined in his own person something of the sacred and the kingly characters, and who therefore was a valuable ally in a journey which led through the country of the most lawless and fanatical Arabs.

Arriving late at night at Dizful, and being unable to find the house of the chieftain with whom they proposed to lodge, the travellers were rescued from their difficulty by the intelligence, not of their human guides, but of an Arab mare. One of the party remembered that the mare he was riding had been with him two years before, when he spent several days in the house which they were now seeking; and placing the halter on the animal's neck, he left her to find the way.

"She picked her way carefully, stopping every now and then as if to consider the turning she should take, when at length, after traversing more than half the town, she stopped before an archway closed by a massive door. Her rider at once recognised it as that of Mustafa Kuli Khan's house."

From Dizful Mr. Layard made an expedition to the traditional tomb of Daniel, where he seems to have set his heart on disproving a theory of Sir Henry Rawlinson's respecting the antiquity of a certain cuneiform inscription. Unfortunately for the interests of sound archæology, the black stone which bore these inscriptions, and which was the bone of contention between our two savants, had disappeared before either of them could  
get

get to the spot. It was said to have been destroyed with some explosive, either by Europeans in pure malice, or by Arabs in search of hidden gold. In its absence Mr. Layard had not the slightest hesitation in summing up the whole controversy with the emphatic declaration, that there is absolutely nothing to connect the building with the tomb of Daniel, beyond the fact, that it is near the ruins of the ancient city of Susa.

Early in January 1842 Mr. Layard reached Baghdad, after a rough journey, diversified by those conflicts with predatory and homicidal Arabs which had now become a recognized part of the *modus vivendi*. An even less agreeable incident of travel was perhaps the following. Halting on the road to pass the night, and being overcome with fatigue, Mr. Layard lay down to rest on a piece of baggage which had just been taken from one of the mules. When morning dawned he discovered that he had been sleeping on a coffin, which was being conveyed to the holy soil of Kerbela—‘and had not perceived the nauseous stench which accompanies these convoys of putrefying human remains.’ On arriving at Baghdad, Mr. Layard found letters from England, which determined him to abandon his plan of going to India through Afghanistan. He now resolved to return to England; but, before leaving Baghdad, he desired to establish the fact, of which he had convinced himself by personal observation, that the river Karun could be navigated as far as Shuster by the steamers of the East India Company, which plied on the Tigris and the Euphrates. He had already written a copious memorandum on the Province of Khuzistan, describing the country, its inhabitants, products and resources, and urging the importance of establishing political and commercial relations with it. This memorandum was placed in the hands of Colonel Taylor, the Company’s resident, for transmission to his own principals and to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—then Lord Aberdeen.

But Mr. Layard did not rely, for the furtherance of his design, exclusively on official support. Believing in the virtues of private enterprise, he induced a British merchant in Baghdad, Mr. Alexander Hector, to enter into communication with the principal landowners of Shuster with a view to exporting wool, cotton, and other indigenous products from Khuzistan, and importing British manufactures.

Mr. Layard’s lengthened wanderings and personal observation among the Bakhtiyari, and the other tribes of the Province, had convinced him that their disposition towards England was altogether friendly, and that they would be glad to establish political and commercial relations with us. In view of all these

these considerations, it became a matter of practical interest to ascertain the precise extent to which the Karun was navigable. Previous attempts to explore the river had been only partially successful.

An enterprise of further discovery was now organized from Baghdad. At the end of February, Mr. Layard, accompanied by Dr. Ross and Seyyid Abou 'l-Hassan, left Baghdad in the 'Assyria,' under the command of Lieutenant Selby. The river was flooded, and after surmounting manifold perils of rocks and rapids, the 'Assyria,' owing to a sudden subsidence of the water, was ignominiously stranded some seven miles outside Shuster.

A sudden freshet opportunely intervened, and carried our voyagers to within a mile of Shuster, where a dam of masonry stopped their further progress. But Mr. Layard had attained his object. He had proved that the river was navigable to within a short distance of the city, with a depth of water ranging from twelve to eighteen feet, even during the summer and autumn. 'The fact that vessels of the size of the "Assyria" could reach, from the Euphrates, the foot of the mountains, over which tracks lead to Isfahan and into the very heart of Persia, was thus satisfactorily established.' Some time was spent at Shuster in the work of repairing the vessel, somewhat the worse for her adventurous voyage. And Mr. Layard used the opportunity to collect information about the produce and commercial capabilities of the province, prices, means of transport, trade-routes, and the like. Of the hospitality and kindness of the upper classes of Shuster he speaks very highly, and he attributes the general decency and civilized character of the city to the fact, that 'there were *no Christians, and consequently no grog-shops.*' The lack of these places of refreshment moved the lively wrath of the quarter-master of the 'Assyria,' Mr. Lucas, an officer of whom Sir H. Layard narrates this delightful anecdote :—

'The "Assyria" had been left under his care near Basroa, when there arose one of those violent tornadoes which occasionally sweep over this part of Arabia. The vessel was in great danger. After the storm was over, Mr. Lucas thus recorded the event: "The windy and watery elements raged. Tears and prayers was had recourse to, but was of no manner of use. So we hauled up the anchor and got round the point."'

One would like to peruse the log-book from which this is an extract.

By the middle of May the travellers were back at Baghdad. Just as Mr. Layard was starting for England, news arrived that  
the

the Sultan was about to declare war against the Shah. Colonel Taylor was naturally anxious that Sir Stratford Canning (afterwards Lord Stratford de Redcliffe), then the British Ambassador at the Porte, should be fully and accurately informed as to the matters in dispute between the two Powers. And as it was understood that the quarrel arose chiefly from the proceedings of the Matamet in Khuzistan, Colonel Taylor requested Mr. Layard, who had so recently been an eye-witness of the Matamet's conduct, to proceed to Constantinople with despatches to Sir Stratford. He accepted the charge, and after an extraordinarily rapid journey, chiefly on horseback, he reached Constantinople on the 9th of July. On arriving at the British Embassy, our traveller was received with extreme discourtesy by a young attaché, and was about to quit Constantinople in high dudgeon, when a courteous letter from Sir Stratford Canning appeased his wrath. He repaired a second time to the Embassy, and was at once admitted to the presence of the Ambassador. A generation which is already forgetting the 'Great Elchi,' and, still more so, a generation which never knew him, may be glad to be reminded, or to learn, what manner of man he was. 'His hair was already white. His tall and spare frame was not altogether erect, as he had the habit of stooping. There was perhaps, a somewhat too evident assumption of dignity and reserve in his manner, which was intended to impress people with the utmost respect for the Queen's Ambassador, and, if the occasion required it, with awe. His earnest grey eyes seemed to penetrate into one's very thoughts. His thin, compressed lips denoted a violent and passionate temper. His complexion was so transparent that the least emotion, whether of pleasure or anger, was at once shown by its varying tints. A broad and massive overhanging brow gave him an air of profound wisdom and sagacity. He was altogether a very formidable-looking personage, and he made upon me the impression which he, no doubt, intended to produce.' The upshot of this interview was that, pending the issue of British mediation between Persia and Turkey, Mr. Layard was requested to undertake a confidential mission of enquiry to the western part of Turkey in Europe, and especially Bosnia and Servia, as it was probable that political events of importance would soon occur in those provinces. Accordingly on the 20th of August he left Constantinople in an Austrian steamer for Salonica. From Salonica he proceeded towards Albania, he reached the Servian frontier, but found it occupied by irregular troops, and the province in a state of war. With some difficulty he made his way safely to Belgrade.

Mr. Layard

Mr. Layard convinced himself that the true policy for England, if she intervened at all in Servian affairs, would be to support the movement in favour of national independence, and to resist the interference of Russia. He desired to lay these views as quickly as possible before Sir Stratford Canning, lest, misled by the English Consul-General, he should take steps which would lead to war in Servia. Mr. Layard at once departed for Constantinople, 'riding post,' as the most expeditious means of transit. Riding at full gallop, by Nissa and Adrianople, across the open plains of Roumelia, he reached Constantinople at daybreak on the sixth day after leaving Belgrade. The journey of six hundred miles had been performed in less time by some hours than it had taken Colonel Townley, a Queen's messenger, whose ride over the same ground had been cited by Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons as the fastest on record. On presenting himself to Sir Stratford Canning, Mr. Layard found that the Ambassador had arrived, on independent grounds, at a similar conclusion as to the revolution in Servia, and the proper policy of the English Government. He condemned the precipitate action of the Consul-General, and directed him to return to his post without delay. Russia, unfortunately, was determined to crush the popular movement in Servia, and had induced Lord Aberdeen, always open to Russian influence, to adopt a view diametrically opposed to that of Sir Stratford Canning. That resolute man stood firmly to the opinions which he had formed, and was thus brought into something very like actual collision with his official chief, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It soon became known that, in taking this independent line, Sir Stratford was to a certain extent actuated by the representations of Mr. Layard, and this knowledge operated to the prejudice of the young adventurer. In particular, it induced the Foreign Secretary to oppose Sir Stratford's design of employing Mr. Layard as an attaché at the Embassy.

For two years Mr. Layard remained in Constantinople, in hopes of obtaining the diplomatic employment which Sir Stratford was anxious to give him, but which Lord Aberdeen refused to sanction. Wearied with waiting, in 1844 he left Constantinople, to enquire into certain atrocities alleged to have been practised on the Christians of Northern Albania, by Albanian rebels who had defeated the Sultan's troops. But very shortly afterwards, the collapse of the insurrection left him at liberty to return to Constantinople. He now took up his residence at the British Embassy, at which he received informal employment. In 1845, Sir Stratford Canning returned to England on leave of absence.



absence. This gave Mr. Layard an opportunity for which he had long been waiting. He had never given up the hope of returning to Mesopotamia, and exploring the ruins of Nineveh. The success of M. Botta's labours at Khorsabad had stimulated his desire to make excavations in the mounds of Nimroud and in those opposite Mosul, which, he was convinced, contained monuments of great antiquity and importance. He therefore suggested to Sir Stratford that he might employ the time which would be covered by the Ambassador's absence on leave, in proceeding to Mosul and making these long-projected examinations. Sir Stratford heartily approved of the plan, and generously undertook to share the necessary expenses. In October, 1845, Mr. Layard left Constantinople for Mosul. The result of that memorable journey was given to the world in the work on 'Nineveh and its Remains,' which was written in 1848 and published in the ensuing year, when, as the reward for his various services and his attainments as a discoverer, Mr. Layard had been appointed an unpaid attaché of the British Embassy at Constantinople.

Such, in brief and imperfect outline, are the early adventures of Sir Henry Layard. They disclose a degree of physical and mental vigour, a fertility of resource, an intuitive discernment of probabilities, a power of connecting scattered evidences and following up suggestive clues, such as fall to the lot of very few men, but can hardly fail to carry those few far on the road to honour and success. With a congenital love of adventure and a genuine passion for discovery, Sir Henry Layard evidently combined a natural insight into geographical and ethnological problems, and a keen eye for their relation to politics and commerce. The impression which, even at that early period, he had made upon the most gifted of his contemporaries at Constantinople, may be seen from the following letter, written in 1845 by Mr. Percy Smythe, afterwards Lord Strangford, then an attaché at the Embassy:—

'My principal friend here is a man of the name of Layard, whose history is somewhat romantic. Some years ago, being in the Company's service, he arrived here at Constantinople on his way out. Here he foregathered with a countryman, and these young Delhis (madmen) started off on foot with a compass to see the world. They arrived at Bagdad; one went by the Persian Gulf to Bombay; Layard disappeared, and about three years afterwards reappeared in the Ambassador's palace here. He had wandered, on foot and alone, through the wildest part of Kurdistan and South Persia, and walked back again, when tired, in the guise of a Kurd or Arab, or some such wild animal. His great passion is ancient and Oriental geography; he is a fair scholar, well up in Herodotus, and a grand router-out of antiquities.

antiquities. He had been all last year at Mossul in the thick of the cholera. His workmen used to die by cartloads. I never spent so pleasant a month as this last while he was living with me. He is a very remarkable man, of the most prodigious knowledge, not of books but of men, gained by ten years' travel between the Danube and the Indus, without a penny in his pocket, and rising daily without knowing where he would sleep, with his very life in hourly danger. To all this he adds a most correct judgment, much reading, and many accomplishments. He has, I believe, obtained a post in this Embassy, where he will be invaluable, and will, I hope, rise to be its head. His intellect and force of character are fully equal to those of Sir Stratford, and his knowledge is infinitely greater.\*

It is not difficult to see that the experience which is here described, acting on such a temperament as that with which Nature had endowed Austen Henry Layard, formed a unique preparation for his subsequent career as British Ambassador to the Porte, and contributed in no slight degree to the establishment of that personal authority which in later years he was able to exercise over the rulers of the Ottoman Empire—an authority which no subsequent Ambassador has ever attained.

As regards Sir Henry's general view of Oriental problems, if a word of respectful criticism be permissible, it seems to us that he forms too favourable a judgment of the ethical qualities of Mohammedanism, whether as affecting the individual character, or as affording a basis for national polity. And at the same time we conceive that, in his very unflattering estimate of the moral standard among Eastern Christians, he assigns less than its just weight to the benumbing and degrading influence of religious and social persecution, sustained during centuries by a dominant race.

But our author's views of comparative theology form no part of our present business. Our concern is with the stirring tale of experience and achievement which he has told us in these bright and instructive volumes. He has touched life at many points. Famed in turn as a traveller, an author, a diplomatist, a Parliamentarian, and a Statesman, it is as a great Discoverer that he will figure in the records of Queen Victoria's reign.

'E'en in our ashes live their wonted fires,'

and every one will be glad to see that, in these later days of a lengthened and laborious career, Sir Henry Layard retains the energetic intellect and the sanguine temperament which, in the romantic enterprise of half a century ago, laid the first foundation of his enduring fame.

\* Foublanque's '*Lives of the Lords Strangford*,' p. 257.

ART. V.—*The Mammoth and the Flood; an attempt to confront the Theory of Uniformity with the facts of recent Geology.*  
By Henry H. Howorth, M.P., F.S.A., M.R.A.S. London, 1887.

OF this goodly volume, crammed to repletion with facts, quotations, and references gathered from a wide field of reading and observation, the author says, and with ample justification, that its title reads like a challenge, and is meant to be a challenge. 'Here is my glove,' he exclaims like a knight of the age of chivalry, as he throws down his *gage de combat* before the public, 'I am ready to fight for it.' We will say at once, that to take up the defiance, and enter the lists as an antagonist *à outrance*, is not our intention; nor would these pages be exactly the arena suited for such a conflict, even were we more pugnaciously disposed than we are. Our chief endeavour will be limited to making clear to that very important personage in our eyes, the general reader, what the challenge is about, and by what an array of facts and inferences it is sustained; it being understood that the author in the present volume, comprehensive as it is, does not profess to have exhausted his subject, and explicitly reserves a large amount of corroborative evidence and collateral discussion for a subsequent work.

To plunge, then, into the midst of the matter, the object against which the attack is directed is the theory of Uniformity, as now generally held, and treated as an incontrovertible axiom, by the modern British school of geologists; the devoted adherents of that theory are the persons challenged to stand forth in its defence. No one who has any acquaintance with the fascinating science, by which the hieroglyphics incised in Nature's stone-book are deciphered, needs to be reminded that the theory owed its existence to that very distinguished and admirable man of science, Sir Charles Lyell; and was the outgrowth of a healthy reaction from the extravagances of the earlier view, which, in order to account for the shaping of the earth's surface, and the changes to which its strata bear witness, called in the aid of many vast and sudden catastrophes, whether natural or supernatural, enormously surpassing in their intensity and devastating power any movements or convulsions of nature which have occurred in historical times. In opposition to that earlier view Lyell enunciated the dogma, that 'the forces now operating upon the earth are the same in kind and degree as those which, in the remotest times, produced geological changes;' meaning to assert generally, that the revolutions through which the surface of the globe has successively passed, whether

whether by the elevation or submersion of continents, the formation of mountains and valleys, the hollowing out of water-courses and lake-beds, or the emergence and disappearance of races and tribes in both the animal and vegetable kingdoms,—were brought about gradually and slowly, during incalculable lapses of time, by such natural processes as those which we see going on around us in the present age. In accordance with the usual course of controversies between theories new and old, the disciples of the rising school outwent their more cautious master, and strained the doctrine of Uniformity somewhat beyond the limits within which he appears himself to have confined it. It is by oscillations of this kind, rather than by an undeviating progress, that the sciences are wont to make their way. From one extreme the pendulum has a tendency to swing into the opposite; but as it has been well remarked, by means of these alternate antagonisms advance is gradually achieved. At present the geological field at home is strongly held by the Uniformitarians, who have pretty well silenced the Convulsionists, as those of the older school have been nicknamed; but there are again signs of a change in the air, and we shall not be surprised to see, ere long, an appreciable modification of the theory of Uniformity, or rather of its practical application, in the scientific creed of the future.

Of such a change the bulky work before us is, perhaps, the most impressive sign that has yet been manifested in this country, but it is by no means the first. About ten years ago, a protest to the same effect was anonymously made in a small and unpretending, but important publication, under the title of 'Scepticism in Geology.'\* It differed in the mode of handling the subject from Mr. Howorth's volume, in that it dealt with a much wider range of phenomena. Its contention was, that the processes of change which we are able to watch going forward on the earth's surface, such as the movement of the soil by earthquakes, the emission of lava and ashes by volcanoes, the denudation of the surface by atmospheric influences, the grinding of rocks by ice, the erosion of watercourses by running streams, and so on—that these familiar processes, even when every possible allowance of time has been granted them, cannot rationally be credited with having upheaved or carved out the great mountain ranges, washed continents down into the oceans or raised them out of the deep, scooped out the long valleys and profound rock-girdled lakes, determined the flow of torrents and rivers, or hewed out into their existing forms the towering

\* By Verifier. 2nd ed., London, 1878.

precipices and tremendous clefts and fissures which face or divide the gigantic masses of rock. In contrast with the method of that prior protest against the extreme form of the doctrine of Uniformity, Mr. Howorth limits himself to the examination of a single geological phenomenon, one that is not mentioned in the earlier work, and accumulates for its elucidation an extraordinary amount of material of a very interesting character. What he concentrates his attention upon is the Mammoth; and after discussing from every point of view the appearances presented by the remains of that gigantic denizen of prehistoric times, he draws the inference, that they could not have been produced by any imaginable cause except some sudden, far-reaching catastrophe, of a kind which the Uniformitarian theory, as applied by its thorough-going advocates, refuses to admit within the category of probable causes. The main line of the induction by which this conclusion is reached, we shall now ask the reader to follow.

What was the Mammoth? When did the plains tremble beneath the tread of its mighty herds? Where do its remains abound,—in what state or position do they present themselves,—to what cause or manner of extinction do they seem to point? Such are the questions which have to be answered, before the argument can be brought to its final point, and Mr. Howorth's volume supplies ample, and often very curious, details for the purpose. We quote the opening sentences of his first chapter, as putting the subject clearly, and in an interesting manner, before us. He writes:—

'There is perhaps no inquiry in the whole range of Natural History more fascinating and romantic than that which deals with the Mammoth and its surroundings. Even children and unsophisticated people have their imagination stirred when they read how in the dreary and inhospitable wastes of Northern Siberia, where neither tree nor shrub will grow, where the land for hundreds of miles is covered with damp moss barely sprinkled for two months with a few gay flowers, and during the rest of the year is locked in ice and snow, and where only the hardiest of polar animals, the white fox and the polar hare, the raven and the snowy owl, can live, there are found below the ground huge hoards of bones of elephants and other great beasts whose appetites needed corresponding supplies of food. But our interest rises to the highest pitch, when we are told that this vast cemetery not only teems with fresh bones and beautiful tusks of ivory, but with the carcasses and mummies of these great animals so well preserved in the perpetually frozen soil, that the bears and wolves can feed upon them. Such stories almost invite credulity, and when credulity is dissipated, they as naturally arouse the elementary philosophical instincts of our nature: and whether we be  
trained

trained in the ways of science or no, we are constrained to ask, How and why are these things so? The discussion, if not the solution, of this problem is the object of the following pages.'

To begin from the beginning,—the Mammoth is an elephant of an extinct species, known in palæontology as *Elephas primigenius*, heavier-boned than its modern congeners, and with tusks of much greater length and curvature, which lived in the last of the so-called geological eras, when the surface of our globe was settling down, so to speak, into its present condition. The primary or palæozoic ages, with their long successions of rudimentary marine life, and the secondary or mesozoic, with their throngs of uncouth reptilian monsters, had long vanished in the gulf of the dateless Past; the tertiary or kainozoic period, gradually introducing the Mammalian tribes, which culminated in a crowd of huge elephantoid and ursine pachyderms, had run through its early, middle, and later stages, the Eocene, Miocene, and Pleiocene; when latest born among its kindred, and nearest in type to the corresponding forms of the modern world, the Mammoth appeared on the scene. How it acquired its familiar name, which was first heard in Europe about two centuries ago, is a curious story, leading us back unexpectedly to the Hebrew Scriptures. The Behemoth of the Book of Job, pronounced by the Arabs Mehemot, supplied an epithet which was familiarly used to designate anything monstrous; and when mediæval traders of that race, penetrating into Tartary, came across the huge bones, teeth and tusks of the fossil Elephantoid, it was no wonder that they applied the name to these strange objects, and to the beast of which they were the relics. From them the native Russians caught it, and adopting it into their language modified the pronunciation to its present sound.

Long, however, before this, and even before the Christian era, occasional 'finds' of the larger bones of the Mammoth, and other kindred Proboscidiæ, in various parts of Europe had excited the wonder of the common people and the curiosity of the enquiring, and given birth to many a strange legend. As our author remarks,

'It was natural that unsophisticated men should not only treat these immense bones as proofs of the former existence of giants, but should also found upon them mythological tales. The enormous bones found in caves and buried under great rocks gave rise most probably to the stories of the Gigantes and the Titans who fought with the Gods, and whom the Gods overwhelmed and buried under great rocks.'—p. 13.

Nothing, of course, would be lost in telling the story of these strange discoveries. The portions of the skeleton most enduring

and most easily recognised, the huge skull, teeth, vertebræ, and leg-bones, became larger still in flying rumour, and the imaginary giants constructed out of them might be anything from a dozen to a hundred feet in stature. To fasten on these the names of many a mythical hero or famous warrior was easy, and doubtless a pleasant thrill of awe and mystery was engendered by the feeling of being thus brought into communion with the mighty dead. Among persons of less reverent temper, familiarity, it seems, went on to breed contempt, or at least to give predominance to a more utilitarian sentiment. We hear of a giant's leg being turned to account for the purpose of bridging over a deep ravine in Arabia, where it was kept in working order by being rubbed with oil purchased out of the tolls charged for the privilege of crossing upon it. Even the Nile itself was rumoured to have been for a time spanned by the body of the giant Auj, who fell by the hand of Moses. And to come down to modern times, not a hundred years ago the thigh bone of a fossil Proboscidian did duty in St. Vincent for the relic of some gigantic saint, St. Christopher we may suppose, where it was solemnly carried in an intercessory procession to procure rain during a season of drought.

The giant-theory, after long tenure of the public mind, was at last routed by the recognition of the not very recondite fact, that the forms of the disinterred relics were bestial rather than human. But gigantic beasts proved a severer trial to faith than gigantic men, and ingenuity stepped in with less incredible explanations. The handiest solution was to the effect, that Nature produced these things in sport, fashioning them at random out of her raw material by way of working off her superabundant energy. How prone the minds of men were to accept this curious idea may be inferred from the case of the celebrated Italian surgeon and savant in the 16th century, Gabriel Falloppio, of whose researches in anatomy and botany the scientific nomenclature of those sciences has preserved an enduring memorial. Assiduous and intelligent as was his study of the physical world, he yet found no difficulty in holding that the fragments of pottery accumulated in that great rubbish-heap in Rome, the Monte Testaccio, were works of nature, not of human art.\* On this crude notion philosophy (save the mark!) did not disdain to bestow its constructive skill, and dressed it up in what, to the eyes of ignorance, seemed a more than plausible shape. The process of fermentation was invoked to supply the generative power;

\* See his two treatises, entitled '*De medicatis aquis atque de fossilibus*,' p. 109. Venetiis, 1569.



this was supposed to stir into action a certain seminal virtue pervading the universe, which, when it failed to meet with a congenial matrix wherein to originate living creatures, stopped half-way, and produced mere bones and shells and abortive organisms. A further refinement was attained when the hypothesis was started, that the fossils were really in their origin animal relics, left behind by beasts of an ordinary size, and owed their gigantic dimensions to a posthumous growth, due to the fostering action of the soil in which they had lain. To the present generation such theories will certainly seem deserving of no milder treatment than to be summarily dismissed with a contemptuous smile; yet some of us, whose youth was cast in the days when Buckland and Sedgwick were strenuously fighting on behalf of the infant science of geology, and 'Moses *versus* Lyell' became a theological war-cry, can remember that even respectable divines avowed their readiness to fall back on the *lusus-naturæ* theory, as a preferable alternative to the admission of any pre-Adamite eras in the story of the earth.

Starting now from the assured relation between the fossil relics and the once living animal, we have to take account of the consequences which follow from it. And first, as to the *habitat* of our great Elephantoid. If from Europe the north-western corner, including North Britain and Wales, be cut off, and also a central and southern portion of which the Alpine chains are the focus, it may be broadly said that throughout all the rest of the Continent the remains of the Mammoth are more or less plentiful. In some parts the frequency of them is astonishing. Beneath the shallow sea, for instance, between Norfolk and the opposite coast, they are so abundant that, in sailor's talk, the locality goes by the name of the burial-ground. In Lower Suabia, we are told, scarcely a railway cutting, a cellar, or a well can be dug, without some bone or tooth being unearthed. Belgium is particularly rich in this fossil wealth, and almost equally so are the broad plains of Russia from the White Sea to the Black. Passing eastwards from northern Europe, we meet the remains of the Mammoth profusely scattered over the whole vast range of Asiatic Siberia. From this region its tusks have long been, and still continue to be, exported in large quantities as fossil ivory; and of some spots which happen to have been better explored than others, we are told that the soil seems to be almost entirely composed of the bones of the great Mammal. What is still more curious is the fact already noticed, that from time to time, as the frozen cliffs, which in many places hem in the rivers, are undermined and break away, there starts out from its icy grave the gigantic beast itself, still  
clothed

clothed in its hairy hide as it roamed the wilds untold millions ago, and with its flesh so well preserved in Nature's own refrigerator as to furnish a succulent banquet to the prowling carnivora of this degenerate age.

Now just as the presence of the Mammoth's remains throughout the greater part of Europe constrains us to believe, that in the pleistocene era those temperate regions were the home of this great Proboscidian ; so the equal abundance of its remains all along the northern side of Asiatic Siberia compels us to accept the conclusion, that in the same era its herds not only visited, but permanently inhabited, the vast steppes of that now perpetually frozen region. It is indubitable that, broadly speaking, where the bones and carcasses lie, there the animals died. No theory of subsequent water carriage can adequately account for the presence of the relics where they are found. Their site, their condition, their enormous quantity, alike repudiate such a solution of the problem. The bones and tusks bear no marks of detrition, such as would necessarily have been produced, had they been swept and rolled along by rivers or floods from more southern lands. They abound in localities to which no streams could have floated them, and are even more plentiful in the elevated clays than along the coast or in the plains bordering on the rivers. Besides, in not a few cases both the skeletons and carcasses have been found standing upright in their clayey or gravelly sepulchres, showing that the animals had either sunk in the soft sediment, or been engulfed as they stood by the turbid waters, and been frozen in before they could fall over. Some of the remains even exhibit marks of death by suffocation ; and what is perhaps still more remarkable, the upright carcasses have been observed to face in a particular direction, as if the animals were overtaken while fleeing from the pursuing flood. Nor can it be maintained that the real home of the great herds was far to the south, and that it was during short annual excursions northwards to summer feeding grounds that they met their fate, and were entombed in the soil. For what imaginable purpose should they have migrated to such a region, or how could they have lived when they arrived there with their young ? The Mammoth is a tree-feeder, and could not at any season of the year have found nourishment in that terrible Arctic climate. The case against the hazardous explanation of the Uniformitarians, that these huge pachyderms merely passed their summers in the extreme north, cannot be more forcibly stated than in Mr. Howorth's words :—

‘ If the Mammoth migrated in large herds with his young ones for  
a summer

a summer jaunt to the Arctic sea, it is hardly credible that he should take with him, stored up in his paunch, a sufficient store of food to last him while there. We know the kind of food he and the Rhinoceros fed upon, and we have the actual *débris* of their food forthcoming from the recesses of their teeth, and *this food is not now found along the Arctic sea, or in Chukchiland or in New Siberia.* This is a crucial test. While this kind of vegetation is not now found growing there, *débris* of a similar kind is largely found in the same beds as the Mammoth remains, and with it also a large assemblage of helices and other land shells now living much further south. Now even if we could credit a Mammoth migrating with its young and its fellows out of mere wanton love of pleasure to the dreary outlet of the Lena and the Yana and back again, and making elaborate commissariat arrangements for the journey, we cannot conceive trees doing so, nor would the proverbial snail make a very long journey in the six weeks of ambiguous summer prevailing in those latitudes. Plants and snails cannot migrate. They must stay the winter through.—pp. 62, 63.

The conclusion thus reached, that the whole range of northern Asiatic Siberia in the pleistocene era was the *habitat* of enormous troops of Mammoths, carries with it as an inevitable corollary that the climate of this now ice-bound region was at that time a temperate one. Here we arrive at the most critical point of the argument with which our author assails the theory of Uniformity. The question that presents itself is this:—Did the climate change by slow degrees, little by little dwarfing the vegetation, stunting and curtailing the forests, and exerting an adverse and repressing influence upon animal life, until the increasing scarcity of food and severity of the conditions of existence depopulated the country of its gigantic pachyderms, and finally extirpated the race? Or was the change from genial warmth to perpetual frost a sudden and overwhelming one, bearing witness to some vast physical convulsion which at one fell swoop destroyed both the animal races that peopled the land, and the forests that sheltered and fed them?

To answer this question, Mr. Howorth brings together a great variety of considerations, upon which we can but touch briefly. That the Mammoth and its kindred, together with many other tribes of animals, disappeared from Europe and Asiatic Siberia about the same epoch is indisputable. What was the cause of this wholesale extirpation? That the cave-men of the period, supposing them to have then existed, destroyed these mighty creatures with their puny flint weapons is incredible. Savage races, even better armed, have never been known to exterminate the wild beasts of their neighbourhood; nor is there the faintest extant sign to indicate that any of the great  
pachyderms

pachyderms of the pleistocene perished by human hands. Again, the hypothesis of the mutual destruction of the animals by each other is not a whit more probable. The carnivora do not prey upon one another, at any rate not to the point of extermination; neither are they accustomed to pile up in heaps, ungnawed and unmutilated, the skeletons of the animals on which they feed. Of animals, whether large or small, which die in the ordinary course of nature, the remains are generally of extremely rare occurrence; they for the most part vanish amidst the wear and tear of the elements, and leave no trace. Even such wholesale causes of mortality as murrains, famines, or unusually severe seasons, fail to solve the problem. Whole continents are never swept bare of life by such visitations; the victims do not fall in their normal vigour, full of food; nor are their remains at once buried in compact clays and gravels, where they may be preserved from injury for long ages to come.

All these considerations point to the extinction of the Mammoth and its contemporaries in the Old World by some abnormal cause—some sudden, very extensive catastrophe which overwhelmed them in the fulness of their vigour, and covered in their remains before the weather could disintegrate and destroy them. Having got this general idea, we carry it up to the Mammoth cemeteries of Siberia, and find a peculiar and striking corroboration of it in the huge carcasses entombed in the frozen gravels and sediments. These tell us that one moment those ponderous Elephantoids were standing in the plenitude of their rugged strength amidst the verdant forests of a temperate clime; while the next moment found them struggling for life amidst the pebbly, muddy deposits heaped around and upon them by some immense irruption of waters, where they were solidly frozen in while their flesh was still uncorrupted, and where they have remained unthawed down to the present time. Here, then, is the answer to our question. From the temperate era in Asiatic Siberia to the era of unbroken Arctic rigour, the transition was instantaneous, and was contemporary with the sudden extinction of almost the whole fauna and flora of the land.

So much for the witness borne by the Siberian Mammoth in particular, and its European congeners generally, to the occurrence of some tremendous catastrophe of waters, which swept the great pachyderms out of existence, and simultaneously changed the climate of Northern Europe and Asia into one of Arctic severity. Had we space sufficient, we might follow Mr. Howorth into the New World, and accompany him as he collects evidence to the same effect from the remains of the

Mammoth's

Mammoth's near trans-Atlantic relative, the Mastodon. We must, however, be content with summing up this testimony in the remark, that although no buried carcasses of that massive Proboscidian are to be found there, owing to there being no frozen ground to preserve them, or at least none that has been explored; yet its remains, which are abundant both in North and South America, are characterized by such freshness and completeness, such an intermixture of mature and young individuals, and such postures and environments, as apparently to preclude any explanation by the ordinary causes of decay, and to force us back on some devastating convulsion which let loose over the continent an overwhelming deluge of waters, and entombed in their deposits these monsters of a vanished age.

There is corroborative evidence, however, of a different kind to which we must call attention, because of its unexpected nature and very great interest. It is the witness furnished by the relics of primitive man. That an early race of mankind existed in the pleistocene period, alongside of the Mammoth in the Old World, and the Mastodon in the New, seems now to be established beyond reasonable doubt by the immense abundance of stone weapons and implements, by the incised bones of animals, and even by portions of the human skeleton, which have been found so intimately associated with the fossil relics of those great pachyderms as to demonstrate the contemporaneity of the deposits. Since the publication of Lyell's work on the Antiquity of man, which first gave this new and startling discovery a firm hold on the English mind, the evidence in support of it drawn from the bone-caves of Europe, and from the gravel and clay-beds where the remains of the Mammoth and its associates lie, has been immensely increased: and while we are writing we observe that, in an interesting article in the 'Nineteenth Century' Review of last November, Mr. A. R. Wallace has forcibly summed up the very extensive mass of evidence which has recently been accumulated for the 'Antiquity of man in North America.' If then any reliance can be placed on the best supported inductions of Geology, the fact must be accepted that the 'stone-men,' as they have been conveniently designated, lived face to face with the huge Proboscidi-ans of the pleistocene age, over a large portion of the globe. We say, the stone-men; but here a distinction must be made, and it is a distinction upon which the pertinency of the fact to our general argument depends. Accurate examination of the stone implements and other relics of this primitive race, together with careful exploration of the deposits in which they are discovered, has led to a division of them into two well-defined

defined classes, not contemporaneous in origin, but divided by a clearly marked interval of time which must have been of considerable duration. This discrimination of the implements carries with it a like discrimination of the races which fashioned and used them. The later, or neolithic, race of the stone-men are proved by their remains to have differed greatly in habits, tastes, degree of cultivation, and manner of life in general, from the earlier or palæolithic race,—differed in fact so radically as to render it highly improbable that the difference was merely due to development. The facts lead to the conclusion, that the older race disappeared or became extinct, without leaving posterity; and that after a while, long in actual years, although short in geological time, another race, less savage if less artistic in perception, came in and occupied the vacant lands. There is perhaps no better authority on this point than Mr. J. Geikie, and he writes as follows:—

‘Between Palæolithic and Neolithic man there is thus a wide gulf of separation. From a state of utter savagery we pass into one of comparative civilization. Was this Neolithic phase of European archæological history merely developed out of that which characterized Palæolithic times? Was the European Neolithic man the lineal descendant of his Palæolithic predecessor? There is no proof, either direct or indirect, that this was the case. On the contrary, all the evidence points in quite an opposite direction. When Neolithic man entered Europe, he came as an agriculturist and a herdsman, and his relics and remains occur again and again immediately above pleistocene deposits, in which we meet with no trace of any higher or better state of human existence than that which is represented by the savages who contended with the extinct mammalia.’—‘Prehistoric Europe,’ p. 379.

We arrive now at Mr. Howorth’s use of this distinction between the older and newer races of the stone-men. It was the former alone which was contemporary with the Mammoth, Mastodon, Megatherium, Dinotherium, and other gigantic mammals of the pleistocene, *and it did not survive them*. When these huge tenants of the forests and fields of the first stone age passed away, the early stone-men passed out of existence also, and the world knew them no more. The same cause, apparently, which swept away the one swept away also the other, involving both in a common ruin. A synchronous destruction of such a wholesale kind seems clearly to bespeak the same identical extirpating cause. But, asks Mr. Howorth, how is it possible to imagine the entire human population of a large part of the globe undergoing a clearly defined and complete extinction, at a particular epoch, by the action of any of the ordinary causes  
of

of wasting and decay, or by any other instrumentality than that of some vast continental catastrophe? And how could it leave behind its bones and relics, unweathered and neatly grouped, deep-buried in protecting gravels and alluvial sediments, unless the catastrophic cause was some engulfing flood of waters, bearing along vast masses of clay and pebbles, and depositing them in extensive beds to cover up the ruin which it had wrought? It is thus that from the disappearance of the early stone-men of the pleistocene a testimony is extorted, similar to that which was yielded by the disappearance of the great Elephantoids of the same epoch, and our author feels himself justified in saying:—

‘I believe that the same potent cause which swept away the Mammoth and the Rhinoceros, the cave-bear and the hyæna from Europe, also swept away Palæolithic man, and that this cause was as sudden as it was widespread . . . I submit with every confidence that I have proved the position that the extinction of the Mammoth in the Old World was sudden, and operated over a wide continental area, involving a widespread hecatomb in which man, as well as other creatures, perished; that this destruction was caused by a flood of waters which passed over the land, drowning the animals and then burying their remains; and that this catastrophe forms a great break in human continuity no less than in the biological records of animal life, and is the great Divide when history really begins.’—pp. 252, 256.

Hitherto Mr. Howorth has conducted the argument, of which an outline has now been exhibited, upon purely scientific lines. He has appealed exclusively to natural phenomena; out of these alone he has constructed his induction, by means of these alone he has arrived at his result. No one can question the legitimacy of this process, and as to the validity of the conclusion we are disposed to think that it is fairly made good. Of course our space has not permitted us to notice the many minor supports by which the main structure of the ratiocination is buttressed; to the Australian evidence we have not so much as alluded. But enough has probably been adduced to make the fact clear, that there is a great deal to be urged in favour of a catastrophic ending of the pleistocene age, with its characteristic fauna and flora, over a very considerable portion of the globe by the action of a flood of waters. The cause of that flood Mr. Howorth reserves for future discussion, only hinting in the present volume that it may have been due to the upheaval of the Cordilleras in the South American Continent. But whatever it was, he does not pretend to call in for the purpose the agency of any other than natural forces, and so far he is in agreement



agreement with the Uniformitarian theory. His only real quarrel, in fact, is with those among the upholders of that theory, who ride their hobby so hard as to deny altogether the occurrence of critical circumstances, under which the very same natural forces that produce gradual and slowly accumulating changes are enabled to give rise to sudden and tremendous cataclysms, and their attendant devastation and ruin. And this, from a scientific point of view, is not an antagonism of principles, but only of applications and details. What we mean may be made evident by the following supposition.

Let us imagine that the earth, once intensely heated, had slowly cooled down and shrunk in cooling through the operation of ordinary physical causes, and that a portion of its superficial crust, arched over a million or two of square miles, being left less and less supported over the increasing vacuum beneath it, had at last fallen in with a crash, upheaving its fractured edges into rugged mountain ranges, creating deep ravines and valleys by its rents and fissures, and starting some mighty oceanic wave to roll with desolating fury over neighbouring lands: it would be undeniable that the catastrophic climax of this series of events would lie just as much within the Uniformity of nature, as the previous gradual cooling and shrinking. We have been recently warned that even in our own times some convulsion of this startling kind is far from being impossible. The bottom of the Western Atlantic, we are told, is becoming more and more heavily weighted by the immense quantities of sediment washed down by the great rivers of the New World; and should this process continue till the pressure of the accumulated masses exceeds the strength of the sustaining crust, the falling in of the whole American sea-board might be the result. Yet such an event, although in the intensest degree catastrophic, would obviously be no breach of Uniformity in the scientific sense. Precisely the same natural forces would have produced it, as those which gently and almost imperceptibly carry on the mildest processes of physical change. In confirmation of this view we are glad to be able to appeal to the high authority of Professor Huxley, who in a striking passage, quoted from one of his public addresses by Mr. Howorth, after observing that he is unable to discern any 'sort of theoretical antagonism between Catastrophism and Uniformitarianism,' goes on as follows:

'Let me illustrate my case by analogy. The working of a clock is a model of uniform action. Good time-keeping means uniformity of action. But the striking of the clock is essentially a catastrophe. The hammer might be made to blow up a barrel of gunpowder, or  
turn

turn on a deluge of water, and by proper arrangement, the clock, instead of striking the hours, might strike at all sorts of irregular intervals, never twice alike in the intervals, force, or number of its blows. Nevertheless, all these irregular and apparently lawless catastrophes would be the result of an absolutely Uniformitarian action, and we might have two schools of clock theorists, one studying the hammer and the other the pendulum.'—Address to the Geological Society, 1869.

While therefore we are inclined to accept Mr. Howorth's conclusion as to the catastrophic character of the close of the pleistocene era, we hold that it is not against the theory of Uniformity itself, as scientifically understood, that he is really contending; but only about the interpretation of certain subordinate phenomena, which, whether they indicate catastrophism, or are consistent with a long-continued and moderate action of natural forces, equally lie within the Uniformitarian hypothesis.

When, however, we reach Mr. Howorth's last chapter, we find ourselves taken out of the region of physical science, and introduced into one of a very different character, where the ground requires careful treading, and our footing feels much less secure. Having inferred his catastrophic flood from the silent witness of the clays and gravels, he seeks direct historical attestation to it from the early myths and traditions of our race. His first appeal is naturally made to the Biblical record of Noah's Deluge, or rather the two independent narratives of it, which modern criticism has perceived to be fused together in the sacred text by the compiler or editor of the canonical Book of Genesis. As closely connected with these he cites the version, probably of earlier date, found in the famous Chaldean tablets, and the more abbreviated one preserved by Berosus. These several variants of the Semitic tradition in his view point to a more remote origin, whence came also the classical legend of Deucalion, and the Phrygian story of the Ark. Running more or less parallel with these he finds various shorter versions of the story among the races of Aryan blood, some inscribed in the sacred books of the Hindoos, others current among the Northmen of Europe. In fact, there are few tribes of mankind, whether in the Old World, the New, or in Australia and New Zealand, which do not yield him in their folklore some legend of a great flood, although it is not always easy to distinguish what is genuinely native from what has been at a late period imported and worked in with the older myths. But after allowing for questionable instances, such as that which is presented by the remarkable currency among the Burmese Karens of traditions closely resembling the early Biblical stories, there

there can be no doubt of the wide prevalence of the Flood-legend; the difficulty arises when we endeavour to estimate its historical value. Mr. Howorth expresses his opinion somewhat dogmatically that 'the first chapter of Genesis is absolutely valueless in geological discussion, and has no authority whatever, save as representing what the Jews borrowed from the Babylonians;' but at the same time he urges that 'there is no reason whatever why subsequent chapters which profess to report, not how things arose before man appeared, but the traditions of man himself, should be discarded.' To refuse credence to a story merely because it is contained in the Bible, is obviously irrational; and it is equally irrational to dismiss ancient records with an incredulous sneer, because the narratives contained in them happen to betray to a critical eye admixtures or accretions of a legendary character. Against such extravagances of scepticism it behoves the sober seeker after truth to enter a protest, just as strenuously as against the unenlightened credulity of the dark ages. To use the pregnant words of Dr. Arnold in his edition of Thucydides, when he was testifying against the excesses of a destructive criticism—'It is not to be endured that scepticism should run at once into dogmatism, and that we should be required to doubt with as little discrimination as we were formerly called upon to believe.' Between that *à priori* acceptance of the primitive Biblical narratives as literal and infallible scientific history, which half a century ago was made a test of orthodoxy, and the scornful denial of any historical element whatever in them, there is surely a reasonable medium.

But supposing this is granted, Mr. Howorth's contention demands a good deal more. It is not enough for his purpose that these flood traditions, Semitic, Aryan, Indian, Australasian, and what not, should have a nucleus of genuine history embedded amidst their accretions; he requires them all to point to one and the same flood, and that the particular flood which on other grounds he believes to have swept away the first race of stone-men at the close of the pleistocene age. This is a large draft on our belief, and we confess to being somewhat staggered by it. To prove the opposite is necessarily as impossible as to establish the assumption. The question is one of probabilities, and these may be differently estimated by different minds. The extreme remoteness in historical time, on the one hand, of the catastrophe which is supposed to have extirpated the Mammoth and that portion of its primeval human contemporaries which inhabited the same regions; and on the other, the fact that not a few desolating deluges must in all likelihood have

have occurred in different parts of the world, in the course of the many millenniums which must have elapsed during the slow development of the various succeeding races of mankind; conspire, we think, to render a single origin of the several widely separated traditions, and that an origin coincident with the pleistocene catastrophe, in a serious degree difficult of acceptance. At any rate, we cannot help attaching far greater value to Mr. Howorth's argument from the phenomena brought to light by geological research, than to any direct corroboration of it which can be extracted from the primitive traditions of mankind. At the same time, we readily acknowledge that these plentiful flood-traditions do indirectly afford him important aid; inasmuch as, although the deluges in which they originated may not have been his special deluge, they at least familiarize us with catastrophes brought about by the desolating agency of water.

In regard to the Biblical version of the tradition in particular we feel it incumbent upon us to say something more, to obviate a possible misunderstanding of our view, and prevent grave offence being taken at our apparent classification of the sacred story with the various ethnic flood-legends, *for the purpose of this discussion*. It would be idle, after the discoveries and conflicts of the last fifty years, seriously to contest Mr. Howorth's position, when he denies to the opening chapters of Genesis any absolute determining authority in the problems of physical science and historical research. Whether this position represents the whole of his conception of the worth of that portion of the sacred records, or only one side or aspect of it, we know not, inasmuch as the tenour of his argument does not require him to consider what value the venerable document may possibly have for other and higher purposes. But for ourselves we say emphatically, that in our view the question of its significance in regard to secular knowledge, whether physical or historical, touches only one side of the subject, and comparatively one of very minor importance. In form and in the letter, or regarded merely as a piece of primitive literature, the document may be ideal or legendary, poetry or myth; but not the less are we convinced that, in substance, it is of the highest ethical and religious value, and as part of an inspired Bible contains an early message of revelation from above, adapted to the needs of the world's childhood. We cannot allow that its inner teaching is the less divine, on account of its employing early and possibly unhistorical traditions as its vehicle, or because it clothes its spiritual element in the vesture of allegory and poetical idealism. To our mind the outward  
form

form and fashion of the teaching is one thing, the inward lesson another ; and although in the former we may discern the working and the limitations of the human mind, when knowledge and culture were still in their infancy, in the latter we are profoundly conscious of that living breath of God which, inbreathed into the soul of the prophet, makes him an organ of divine revelation.

To make our meaning clear, and show how separable is the substance of the divine teaching from its literary vehicle, we will ask the reader's attention to the manner in which the cosmogony of the Book of Genesis may reasonably be supposed to have been constructed. Three characteristics of it are obvious. First, it has the style of a poem or psalm of a primordial type ; the rhythmical cadences, the measured intervals, the recurring refrain, suggest, not bald narrative or prosaic description, but artistic, ideal composition,—the result of the inventive faculty operating on certain ideas, and draping them in poetical forms. Secondly, compared with other early cosmogonies, in some degree akin to it, it is singularly pure and noble in its conceptions. Although not entirely free from the anthropomorphism of a primitive age, it has entirely escaped the taint of polytheism, and none of the puerilities which so often disfigure the corresponding ethnic legends can be laid to its charge. Lastly, it is the vehicle of sublime religious ideas, which find an echo in the depths of the human heart. As it begins with God and His creative work, so it ends in man and his peculiar prerogatives, teaching him that he stands to his Creator in a relation which is shared by no other terrestrial creature, being framed in the very image of God, and living by the divine breath in his inward being, and having entrusted to him undivided sovereignty over the earth and all its contents. On the face of this grand creation-hymn these three features are unmistakeably stamped, so that he who runs may read them there.

Now what we desire especially to point out is this : that if it was in a free and genuine co-operation of the composer's mind with the revealing Spirit, as these characteristic features seem clearly to indicate, that the noble creation-hymn which heads the Hebrew Scriptures took its origin ; a real and most important distinction not only may, but must be drawn between its religious substance and its literary form,—between its teaching for the soul of man, and the poetic conception or narrative through which that teaching is conveyed. The former, which is the essence of the document, would not be the offspring of the composer's own conceit, but truth mysteriously imparted to him from above, by that supernatural influence which is commonly characterized

racterized as inspiration, for the instruction of his contemporaries in their true relations to God and to the world; while the literary robing of that truth, the order of the narration, the imagery, and the modes of expression employed, would be a product of his own imagination, his own mental action, and therefore purely ideal, and standing in no relation whatever to science or history. In other words, the sacred pen-man would be an inspired writer, a true prophet of Jehovah, through whom came a message of revelation to his people; and yet he would be employing as the vehicle of that message conceptions of nature and its laws and sequences which have no scientific validity, no authority to control our interpretations of the phenomena of the physical world.

The same principle of discrimination may be applied to the interpretation of the succeeding chapters, which present in an appreciably greater degree signs of relationship to the earlier myths and traditions. However rudimentary the ethical and religious instruction conveyed by them may be—and there can be no doubt that is of the lower grade which suits a rude and uncultured stage of the human intellect—yet it is revelation in the germ, the primitive utterance of that divine teaching of our race, which has since unfolded and broadened down the ages, till it attained its mature development in the Gospel of the Son of man. Here, in these earliest essays of inspiration, we have the foundations laid of social life, by the setting forth of the divinely ordained relation between the sexes, and constitution of the family; of spiritual life also, in the disclosures concerning the relation of mankind to the eternal law of morality, the introduction of the consciousness of guilt, and the righteous judgments of God upon disobedience. Veiled more or less in allegory, these fundamental verities may be; but all the same they fulfilled their function in laying a basis for higher doctrines to rest upon, and it is the infused presence of them that lifts those archaic Biblical records immeasurably above the ethnic legends, and constitutes their unique sacredness and priceless worth. So at least we firmly believe; and it is to guard ourselves against the suspicion of having unduly depreciated their value and importance, when speaking of them in relation to merely secular knowledge, that we have felt it a duty to develop the other side of the subject in these supplementary remarks, and emphatically to express our loyal homage to the inspiration of Holy Writ.

- ART. VI.—1. *Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. By James Elliot Cabot. 2 vols. London and New York, 1887.
2. *Works of R. W. Emerson*. 6 vols. London, 1884.
3. *Correspondence of T. Carlyle and R. W. Emerson*. London, 1883.
4. *The Dial*. 4 vols. Boston, 1840–4.
5. *Life of R. W. Emerson*. By Oliver Wendell Holmes. London, 1885.
6. *In Memoriam R. W. Emerson*. By A. Ireland. London, 1882.
7. *Transcendentalism in New England*. By O. B. Frothingham. New York, 1876.

TO some Englishmen the name of Emerson suggests little more than a curious chapter in the history of modern mysticism. To a large section of cultivated Americans, on the other hand, the philosopher of Concord appears the most representative figure in their republic of letters, their most imaginative poet, their greatest teacher, their most vigorous and daring thinker, their most original writer. And their verdict is substantially correct. The estimate may appear excessive, but the exaggeration, if such there be, is prompted by true instincts of national gratitude. A glance at the movement which revolutionized the intellectual and literary condition of America in 1830–40, and the unrivalled influence which Emerson exercised in promoting and directing that movement, will explain, if it does not justify, the verdict of his fellow-countrymen.

In 1830 the United States were a crowded mart, a busy workshop, a bustling 'change. The general standard of life was low. Several years later, thoughtful, spiritual-minded men, like Judd, still protested against the political, social, and religious vices which had corrupted the New England spirit, and seemed inextricably interwoven with public institutions. The brains of the country were attracted into channels of activity, which were hostile to literature, philosophy, and art. Practical men, absorbed in business pursuits, hemmed in by objects of sense, regarding only immediate and obvious utility, had lost faith, if not consciousness, in the higher faculties of their moral and mental natures. They were more eager to get a living than to live. Those who had leisure or capacity for thought were, like Irving, swept away by the tide of imitation, or, like Dana, crippled by dissatisfaction with their surroundings. Fashions, philosophy, literary tone were borrowed from the Old World. Miss Edgeworth and Mrs. Trimmer fed the rising generation upon English conventionalities. Literature

ature



ture displayed the mediocrity of imitation rather than the natural charm of invention; Americans wrote from their memories; they rebuilt the sepulchres of their fathers, not tenements for living men. They had no native standards. Washington Irving caught the graces of Addison, and national vanity satisfied itself with comparing Cooper to Walter Scott, or claiming for Bryant a rivalry with Wordsworth. An Alston might attempt the highest range of pictorial art; but both in painting and poetry American talent was attracted towards inanimate Nature, and in neither field attained the most perfect form of expression. Neither painters nor poets penetrated from the form to the substance. A Bryant or an Innes might render into verse or upon canvas something of the rare fascination which is exercised by the stillness and solitude of forest life. But, as a rule, both landscape painting and descriptive verse displayed little more than accurate memory, patient observation, sensitiveness to beauty, selection of striking effects. In neither the one nor the other was there revealed that imaginative faculty which expresses ideal truth through the forms of Nature, that high poetic vein which submits the shows of things to the desires of the mind.

Industrialism and imitation were not more uncompromising in their hostility to independent culture than was Puritanism. In former generations religion had raised and elevated New England settlers, given strength to character, and fibre to morality. But the grim austerity of Calvinism had never smiled on art; it was iron in its discipline, stern and implacable in its doctrine; it favoured neither freedom nor variety of thought. Puritans, who were unclogged by formalism and unfettered by logic, might still soar upwards into the celestial regions of ecstatic faith; but as the lives of the emigrants had settled down into prose, so the poetry of their religion had fled. Old ideas, passionate piety, and philosophical penetration, met in conflict. Men became sceptics unawares; they doubted the basis of the faith to whose symbols they clung with desperate tenacity. Religion's claim to inspiration was opposed to the dominant philosophy of Locke; Puritan asceticism revolted against the habits of a wealthy democracy. 'The Scarlet Letter' reveals the possibilities, if not the actualities, of the gloomy despotism, which frowned down amusement, carried its *espionnage* into private life, and darkened society with the grim shadow of ministerial tyranny. The inevitable reaction came. Formal, hard, external, it fell an easy prey to Unitarianism. But its successful rival was too dry and material to satisfy the

higher needs of human nature. With all its clearness of thought, mental activity, and sincerity of intention, it had, in 1830, lost its spring. In ceasing to be aggressive, it ceased to be enthusiastic. It rose or fell to a dull level of respectability, on which a sense of propriety replaced religious fervour. Thus the society of the country was industrial, utilitarian, fettered by conventionalities; its religion formal or rationalizing; its art unimaginative; its literature imitative and pusillanimous.

To change these unfavourable conditions was the object of Emerson's teaching. Few men initiated a new departure with more conscious purpose. The text of his first sermon was 'what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' The great end of every man's life is the preservation of his individual mind and character. This lesson of private freedom is the essence of all his later utterances. 'Nature,' his first published composition, was a challenge to the Old World. In his thoughts on modern Literature ('Dial,' October, 1840), the same note is struck; even Goethe fails to satisfy him, not only because of his artistic indifferentism, but because, in Emerson's opinion, he never rose above the sphere of artistic conventionality. The addresses before the Phi-Beta-Kappa Society, and before the Divinity class at Cambridge, produced a profound impression. The first took his audience by storm. It was 'an event,' says Lowell, 'without any former parallel in our literary annals, a scene to be always treasured in the memory for its picturesqueness and its inspiration.' 'It has,' wrote Theodore Parker, who also heard it, 'made a great noise;' and he calls it 'the noblest, most inspiring strain I ever listened to.' In after life he used 'to thank God for the sun, the moon, and Ralph Waldo Emerson.' Many Americans of the present day have testified to the electric shock which these two addresses gave to society. They were everywhere discussed; they provoked numerous replies, created a species of panic among professors like Andrews Norton, and became the occasion of a heated controversy. Emerson alone took no part in this 'storm in a wash-bowl.'

In these early productions Emerson sketched the teaching which he afterwards expanded, developed, and illustrated in all his subsequent lectures and essays. He is moved by the spirit of a new people. He is determined to see in the individual man of to-day the elements of all the greatness, the germ of all the strength, that the noblest historical figures have displayed. Each individual is the lord of circumstance, the maker of his character, the master of his fate. What Plato has  
thought,

thought, every one may think ; what a saint has felt, every one may feel. Names of power do not overawe Emerson ; he is not oppressed by the ruins of the Capitol. 'My giant goes with me wherever I go.' He regards the world with a new vision ; he gives the living present precedence over the dead past ; the vital spark within his nation outweighs the most splendid dust of antiquity. He breathes the free air of the Western prairies. He eschews all alien or artificial inspirations, and studies the material which lies to his right hand and his left. He urges his countrymen to turn from the literature of *salons* to their own modes and customs of life, to contemplate the nature that is before their eyes directly, and not through foreign spectacles. 'Here, on this rugged soil of Massachusetts, I take my stand, baring my brow in the breeze of my own country, and invoke the genius of my own woods.' Not only is he national and the representative of a new people, he is also democratic in his mental attitude. The Puritans had preached the natural depravity of man ; Emerson asserted his inherent worth. He taught that man was capable of self-government, that, if he were but true to himself, his future was serene and glorious. He insisted that every individual human being might be, and ought to be, law, prophet, church to himself. He endeavoured to build up character by individual culture, to develop each man's internal resources so that they should require no external aid, social or religious. He claimed for the individual mind a sovereign freedom of thought, a direct communion with the Infinite mind. 'The foregoing generations,' he writes, 'beheld God face to face ; we, through their eyes ; why should not we enjoy also an original relation to the universe ? Why should not we have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us and not the history of theirs ?' It is this doctrine of self-reliance, illustrated by fresh examples, enforced under new aspects, presented in different shapes, that forms the essence of his philosophy, and was repeated on every platform and reiterated in every essay. His teaching emphatically protested against utilitarian ethics, against material philosophy, against formal religion, against carefully cultured exotics which choked plants of native growth. Ecclesiastically and politically free, America was still intellectually dependent. Emerson enlarged and illuminated his countrymen's conception of national life, and gave to it an impulse and direction which it never lost. His words stirred the blood of his contemporaries like a bugle-call ; the movement he promoted had its excesses and extravagances, but it was fresh, indigenous, national. In 1830  
America

America was intellectually a colony of England. Emerson's writings and addresses from 1836 to 1840 were the 'Declaration of Intellectual Independence.'

It would be absurd to say, that Emerson created an intellectual revival which had commenced in 1820; but he stimulated its progress, and, although he stood aloof from some of its phases, he guided and steadied its course. Other influences were already at work to produce what may be called, without fear of provoking comparisons, the Elizabethan Age of American Literature. It was the spring-time of national independence, and a stir was in the air. The long frost of custom was breaking up; society was preparing to bud and blossom with promise of varied fruit; men were learning to think for themselves. Bryant, Irving, Cooper, the profound mind of Channing, the richly flowered eloquence of Everett had not created an American literature, but they had created an American audience for the discussion of every sort of topic from poetry to criticism. As broader fields of action opened out, as novel controversies occupied the press, as criticism analysed the bases of classical or theological literature, as science destroyed accepted fictions, fresh interests and theories collided with ancient creeds and institutions. The shock of new and old struck the spark of literary life. The revolution began with a change in metaphysics. Thinkers have been for centuries divided into idealists and sensationalists, Transcendentalists and Materialists. The one insists upon thought, will, and inspiration, the other on facts, history, circumstances; the one starts from consciousness, the other from experience; the one treats the external world as the product of man's thought; the other regards man as the product of the external world; the one exalts, the other decries mental abstractions; the one depreciates, the other exaggerates matter; the one emphasizes the unity of reason, the other the variety of sense. From what has been already said of Emerson, it is obvious that he would throw all the weight of his genius into the scale of Idealism. Stripped of its metaphysics, Transcendentalism represents the value of ideals in thought, morals, politics, and reform. Emerson traced the decadence of the human mind to the supremacy of the system of Locke. He deplored the loss of native force, of width of grasp, of depth of feeling, which had achieved great things in literature, art, and statesmanship. Men could not think grandly so long as they consumed their energies in thinking clearly.

Home and foreign influences encouraged the spread of Transcendentalism. The Old World, with its leisured, cultured classes,

classes, scarcely appreciates the difficulty of reconciling social conditions with high aspirations that is experienced in New Worlds, where no shades soften the hard line which severs thought from action. Men are compelled to be either in the world or out of it; their sole claim to honour is their power to do the tangible work before them. Hence refined and cultivated Americans were predisposed in favour of a theory which made thinkers kings, and reduced the tumult of a life, which the nation accepted as the sole reality, into the unreal, shifting product of thought. Nor is it perhaps wholly fanciful to imagine, that the peculiar relations of man and nature influenced the desire to merge in unity that which could not be reconciled. In the New World the nineteenth century stood vividly and sharply contrasted with antiquity; the primitive savage was confronted by the printing press, the silence of the primæval forest was broken by the whirr of the last mechanical invention. The two elements could not be harmonized, but they might be blended in that Absolute which Transcendentalists adored. Moreover, the nation had not lost the sentiment of religion. But the dominant philosophy had undermined the foundations of theology: the axiom, 'nihil est in intellectu nisi prius in sensu,' supplied no basis for faith, no assurance of the attributes or existence of God. The Transcendentalist met unbelief with new weapons. He insisted upon man's communion with the super-sensible world, his power of spiritual perceptions, his intuition into that order of existence to which belong our absolute ideas of truth, justice, beauty, that sphere which lies beyond the region of empiric knowledge, and behind the horizon of the senses. The Americans were thus predisposed in favour of Transcendentalism by their external circumstances and their religious sentiment. Foreign influences tended in the same direction. Swedenborg's dazzling visions, Coleridge's cloudy reveries, Carlyle's denunciations of the present, combined to raise a rebellion against the deadly precision of analytic methods; the new bases for human thought, which were supplied by Kant, Jacobi, Fichte, Schelling, and by Cousin's brilliant expositions of German philosophy, encouraged the reaction against the sensational school; Herder's 'Spirit of Hebrew Poetry,' Schleiermacher's protests against dogmatic religion, stimulated the effort to escape from intellectual bleakness into spiritual sunshine; Schiller, Richter, Novalis, and, above all, Goethe, from many different sides, added force to the recoil from the dominion of the senses, Scotch psychology, and practical materialism.

The passion for intelligible results, for facts which can be  
formularized,

formularized, distinguishes the system of Locke. If this feeling in excess leads to poverty and narrowness of thought, it has compensating advantages. Both its good and its bad side are illustrated by the Transcendental movement. A boundless future seemed to open before the new philosophers. 1836-40 was the Consulate of Plancus, a period to which many young Americans applied the lines of Coleridge—

‘Bliss was it in that hour to be alive,  
But to be young was ecstasy.’

The crust of society was broken up by a volcanic eruption of sentiment. The great wave of Romanticism reached America after its force was spent in Europe, but it gathered irresistible force as it crossed the Atlantic, or encountered less opposition from past or present in its preparations for the future. The movement was one of intellectual emancipation, but it also degenerated into every form of whimsical aberration, into vague schemes of grandiloquent idealism, as well as into the dangerous inanities of spirit-rapping. Abandoning traditions, denying the guidance of history, Transcendentalists launched forth into the sea of life with no compass but their own opinions, and no rudder except their instincts. Men passed through ‘moral phases’ with bewildering rapidity. And here, once more, the influence of Emerson proved invaluable. His reputation has suffered by the association of his name with a local movement from which he really stood aloof. He rebuked alike the fanaticism of the Transcendentalists and the Conservatives. His shrewd, vigorous, and well-balanced judgment gave an every-day meaning to their vague philosophies, and a practical turn to their aspirations; he condensed, concentrated, and vitalized the thin, wandering vapours of their idealism. He saw keenly enough the extravagances and eccentricities of the Della-Cruscans, dilettanti, and philosophical dyspeptics, who called themselves his followers. His strong common sense repudiated their abstention from the duties of domestic and public life. He quietly ridiculed their determination to sit in corners, and wait till the universe bade them work, and he refused to join in the Brook Farm experiment. At the same time he saw the value of this undisciplined enthusiasm, and endeavoured to divert it into useful channels. And thus, indirectly through his influence, the abolition of slavery was proclaimed as a holy war, and the rights of women preached with the ardour of a crusade.

We have endeavoured to explain the position which Emerson holds in the estimation of his countrymen. But unless another  
element

element is considered, we shall do injustice to Emerson and to the judgment of his admirers.

'Sir Philip Sydney, the Earl of Essex, Sir Walter Raleigh, are men of great figure and of few deeds. We cannot find the smallest part of the personal weight of Washington in the narrative of his exploits. The authority of the name of Schiller is too great for his books. The largest part of their power was latent. This is what we call "character"—a reserved force which acts directly and without means.'

In these words Emerson unconsciously discloses another part of the secret of his own influence. Inside and outside his books he was an impressive personality.

In the intellectual history of the 19th century, Emerson is not a man to be skipped. His position is in itself striking—a solitary thinker contemplating the bustling throng of the most money-making nation in the world, a sage of Pagan Greece travelling in the tram-cars of the 19th century, or walking in the grove of Academus undisturbed by the whistle of the steam engine, and, worthy of the age of Pericles, not unmanned by his philosophy. No one reads his books for the sake of clear, systematic, logical expositions. But thousands, who do not value his philosophy for itself, value it for the trains of thought which it awakens, the suggestions which he drew from it, the imagery with which he illustrated it, the inspiration of noble wishes and high aspirations which he made it breathe. So again he broke up the crust of association; he presented new aspects of familiar objects, treated old subjects of enquiry in novel relations, excited his hearers to fresh mental activity. But it was not, alone or in combination, the peculiarity of his position, nor the suggestiveness of his teaching, nor the stimulus which he gave to curiosity that kindled in his audience new life, and imparted to them a subtle change which made them better and greater men. He gave his thought; but he also gave his character to his contemporaries. With rare sincerity he bestowed upon the people what was in his heart and mind. 'His words had power because they accorded with his thoughts, and his thoughts had reality and depth because they harmonized with the life that he always lived'—so wrote Hawthorne in his fine apologue of 'The Great Stone Face,' which we may well believe to be a tribute to the genius of Emerson. He effected the intellectual emancipation of America as much by his example as by his teaching, by his impersonation of the unselfish search for truth, and of the unsatisfied craving for self-improvement, by the realized ideal which he placed before them of 'plain living and high thinking.' Thus it was that he was one  
of



of those men from whom virtue proceeded into others. Thus, too, he won the power to inspire, enkindle, and vivify, to communicate the confidence of hope and the passion for beauty which thrilled and vibrated through his own frame. The purity of his sensitive integrity seems never to have been marred even by childish weakness; no boyish error, no youthful indiscretion, has been laid to his charge. He would have been a wiser philosopher, and a profounder moralist, had he been less coldly and spontaneously upright. His own standard of duty was so high, that he could with safety follow his instincts. His character corrected his intellectual aberrations; it ministered the antidote to the poison of his teaching. But it scarcely needs the example of a Shelley to prove the peril of Emerson's maxim, 'Obey yourself.' If Emerson had had the passions of bad men, or if bad men adopted Emerson's principles, the world would be a Pandemonium.

'Great geniuses,' said Emerson, 'have the shortest biographies.' The loose generalization is characteristic; but the saying is eminently true of his own life, which has been admirably illustrated, from new, and hitherto inaccessible, sources, by Mr. Cabot, the title of whose excellent work heads this article. The blood of generations of 'painful preachers' ran in Emerson's veins. His grandfather built the Old Manse at Concord which proved, in other hands, a second home to Emerson, and from which Hawthorne gathered his immortal mosses. His father, William Emerson, was pastor of the first (Unitarian) Church at Boston; and in that city Ralph Waldo was born in 1803.

As a child Emerson held aloof from his contemporaries.

'When I was thirteen years old' [he writes in his journal in 1839], 'my uncle, Samuel Ripley, one day asked me, "How is it, Ralph, that all the boys dislike you and quarrel with you, whilst the grown people are fond of you?" Now I am thirty-six, and the fact is reversed; the old people suspect and dislike me, and the young people love me.'

'I don't think he ever engaged,' so writes an old schoolfellow, 'in boys' plays; not because of any physical inability, but simply because, from his earliest years, he dwelt in a higher sphere.' The 'clearest recollection' of another schoolfellow 'is that Emerson was singularly free from faults, and this was the substratum for his subsequent expansion in character and intellect.' Memories respecting the boyhood of eminent contemporaries cannot always be trusted; recollections are unconsciously coloured by subsequent achievements. We could almost

almost hope that Emerson was not so white as he has been painted. But, whether the wish is pious or the reverse, the character of his life and thought confirms the impression which he left upon the contemporaries of his boyhood. Beyond doubt, his withdrawal from boyish pastimes and companionship deprived him of a valuable education, encouraged his tendencies to excessive idealism, and fostered what he himself calls his 'cardinal vice of intellectual dissipation.' His natural faults as a thinker were confirmed by his early life. His reveries are not the aimless dreams of a recluse, for from this common tendency of solitude he was saved by his practical sense. But he always lived in a world of principles rather than of facts. He is not firmly bent on making his meaning clear to men of action, exaggerates the importance of his own mission, fondles his crotchets and prejudices. So, too, he looks down upon the wind-swept regions of passion from a serene height of settled peace and marble self-possession. Knowing little or nothing of the remorse and retribution of depravity, standing at an austere distance from human frailty, he catches only an imperfect glimpse of the world's misery, and underestimates the mass of the world's guilt. His eye, accustomed to peer through the mists of cloudland, often regards men like trees walking.

His isolation and seclusion were exaggerated by the circumstances of his studious boyhood. Neither his father nor his mother were demonstrative towards their children; it was the fashion of the day to conceal a real tenderness under a mask of austerity. His aunt Mary Emerson was the strongest influence of his early life. 'She must always occupy,' wrote Emerson, 'a saint's place in my household; and I have no hour of poetry or philosophy since I knew these things into which she does not enter as a genius.' But her pride in her nephew, as well as her fervid enthusiastic nature, rather encouraged than checked the ardour of his studies. Poverty also contributed to isolate him from boyish companionship. In 1811 his father died, leaving behind him a widow and six children. The family was compelled to practise the most rigid economy. Ralph and his brother shared a greatcoat between them, so that they took turns in going out. The boys chopped wood, lit fires, laid tables, ran errands for their mother. They had but little leisure between their school hours and their household work; their spare time was chiefly spent in reading improving books such as Jebb's Sermons, Whelpley's Historical Compend, and Rollin's or Robertson's Histories. But 'the iron band of poverty, of necessity, of austerity,' of which Emerson speaks in  
his

his Essay on 'Domestic Life,' strengthened the boy in frugality and self-denial. As a child of eight, he subscribed six cents. to a circulating library, and got from it the first volume of a thrilling novel. His aunt reproved him for spending money on such a luxury, and he never took out the second volume.

The 'spiritual-looking' child in 'blue nankeen,' who stood at the gate of his father's house 'to see what rude boys were like,' passed through school-life at Boston with the same character for faultlessness, which he afterwards bore throughout life. In 1817 he entered Harvard College. At College he still remained the same retiring, self-contained lad, an amused spectator rather than a sharer of the life around him, determined to keep in what he calls his 'own coop, or tub, of observation.' He showed a considerable facility for verse-making, assiduously polished his style, cultivated English composition, and studied declamation and rhetoric. He was, in fact, preparing himself to be a preacher. In mathematics he describes himself as 'a dunce,' and in philosophy he made no progress. He had, however, made himself well acquainted with the English dramatists, and with poetry, especially in its by-paths. He had also read widely in history and memoirs. His instinct prompted him to slight the exact sciences, but while he wept over the impossible Analytical Geometry, it also led him 'to console his defeats with Chaucer and Montaigne, with Plutarch and Plato.' After he had graduated, he taught for some months in a school, studied divinity, was 'approved' to preach, and in 1829 became the ordained colleague of Henry Ware in the second Unitarian Church of Boston. A year later, when Ware resigned, in order to become professor of pulpit eloquence at Harvard, he became sole minister.

Thus far Emerson's life had been singularly uneventful, and in outward circumstances prosperous. Before he was thirty he had reached a high place in his profession. He was already married. But in 1832 came the one great crisis of his life. He determined to break off his connection with the second Church, because he found himself unable to administer the Communion in the usual form. He was ready to continue his pastorate, if he might abandon the use of the elements, and treat the rite as a mere commemoration. The Church-Committee declined to make any change in the service, and Emerson thereupon resigned his office, though not his Unitarian orders. Although an extravagant idealist, he broke with his Church from what his friends thought to be a Quakerish scruple upon an apparent point of form. But the event was only a symptom of a complete change which had taken place in his thoughts.

His

His own saying, 'Let every man be his own Church,' gives the key to the crisis through which his mind was passing. He rapidly approaches the conclusion that all forms of faith, whether Calvinist or Unitarian, Christian or Pagan, are imperfect versions of the moral law, that souls are not saved in bundles, and that each individual man contains within himself all that he needs for self-government. So strongly did he feel this, that he seems to have been surprised at the decision of the Committee, and his farewell sermon hints his disappointment.

'I have no hostility to this institution; I am only stating my want of sympathy with it . . . . As it is the prevailing opinion and feeling in our religious community that it is an indispensable part of the pastoral office to administer this ordinance, I am about to resign into your hands the office which you have confided to me.'

The mental anxiety of this determination, together with the shock of his wife's death, injured his health. Change was recommended, and on Christmas Day, 1832, he sailed for Europe. So far as his visit had any other purpose than the recovery of his health, he came to study men not places, to see Landor, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Carlyle, rather than Rome or Oxford. 'If Goethe had been still living, I might have wandered into Germany also.' But his conception of Goethe's teaching did not satisfy his mind. He reproached him with seeking truth, not for its own sake, but for the enlargement of the truth seeker; he found in him an artist rather than a man, a preacher of virtues which he did not practise. From Landor's scholarly elegance he had learned the graces of composition; he had caught glimpses of truth from Wordsworth's love of Nature, Platonisms and ideal mysticism, from Coleridge's insistence upon reason as the organ of absolute ideas, from Carlyle's splendid rhetoric. These were the men who, with Swedenborg and the Quaker writers, had in different ways led him to detach religion from its forms, to rest faith on intuition rather than on any historical basis. At Florence he dined with Landor, and found him 'noble and courteous, living in a cloud of pictures at his Villa Ghéardesca.' At Highgate he had a most characteristic interview with Coleridge, 'a short, thick, old man, with bright blue eyes, and fine clear complexion.' The description of the conversation which followed is very humorous. For Coleridge Emerson had some contempt as well as much respect, because he endeavoured to reconcile the ideas of the Anglican Church with absolute ideas. But it is difficult to see upon what principle Emerson determined the truth of his own rejection of all consistency and the falsity of Coleridge's

Coleridge's intellectual craving for unity. At Rydalmount he paid a visit to Wordsworth, a plain, elderly, 'white-haired man, not prepossessing, and disfigured by green goggles.' From Dumfries he drove to Craigenputtock, and 'found the lonely house and desolate heathery hills, where the lonely scholar nourished his mighty heart.' 'It was,' says Emerson, 'a white day in my years;' on the other hand, Carlyle was touched and flattered by the visits of 'this lonely wayfaring man.' The two became fast friends; their leading ideas were diametrically opposed; but the friendship, thus romantically begun, continued throughout their lives.

In 1833 Emerson returned to America. He did not at once give up preaching; but the platform and the lecture room became more and more his pulpit and his church. The subjects of his first two lectures were 'Water' and 'the Relations of Man to the Globe,' strange topics for a man whose scientific reading, though extensive, was desultory. Yet the attraction of the subjects is obvious to the Emersonian. 'It is in my judgment,' he himself wrote, 'the greatest office of natural science to explain man to himself. The knowledge of all the facts, of all the laws of nature, will give man his true place in the system of being.' The next two subjects are also eminently characteristic—'Michael Angelo,' the universal citizen, the friend and brother of all who acknowledged the beauty that beams through universal nature, and 'Milton,' like himself, a rebel against dogmatic belief, austere great, inspired with the same passion for moral perfection. In 1835 he married a second time, and settled at Concord, where—

'Once the embattled farmer stood,  
And fired the shot heard round the world.'

Here he enjoyed seclusion and society; he could haunt the solitudes of Nature, and yet count among his friends the intellectual leaders of the day. From Concord he emerged to lecture throughout America, and gathered audiences not only among the cultured citizens of the East, but among the rough pioneers of civilization in the extreme West. He was, in fact, the creator of the 'Lyceum' system. In 1836 he published at Boston a little volume of less than 100 pages called 'Nature.' The quotation from Plotinus, which is prefixed as a motto, indicates the character of his recent reading, and prepares us for the tone of the Essay. 'Nature' is a vivid, richly-coloured rhapsody, a passionate hymn of delight in the beauty of the outer world, and at the same time a most eloquent statement of ideal pantheism. It is the longest of his Essays, and the one which

which most nearly approached to a regular treatise. But it was twelve years before a first edition of 1200 copies had been sold. His success as a lecturer was more rapid; and it is from the delivery of two orations in 1837 and 1838 that we must date his extraordinary influence over his fellow-countrymen. 'The American Scholar' was delivered before the Phi-Beta-Kappa Society; the Address upon religion was given to the Divinity students of Cambridge. Henceforward his house at Concord became an American Mecca. Hawthorne, sauntering by the indolent Assabeth, saw the pilgrims flocking to it.

'Young visionaries, to whom just as much of insight had been imparted as to make life a labyrinth round them, coming to seek the clue that should guide them out of their self-involved bewilderment; grey-headed theorists, whose system, at first air, had finally imprisoned them in an iron framework, travelling painfully to his door, not to ask deliverance, but to invite the free spirit into their thralldom.'

In 'Nature,' in his two Addresses, and in many of his lectures, Emerson had taken his stand with the idealists against the materialists, with the Platonists against the Aristotelian. But he was a follower rather of Plotinus than of Plato. He advocated with all his force and eloquence that *à priori* philosophy which makes man the measure and the sum of all things. He insisted upon that intuitive insight into spiritual life, which is at once the channel of communication for absolute truths and Absolute Truth itself. This belief in intuition is the one theory by which he is completely dominated. He held that all the parts, particles, and varieties of Nature and of man are one; that the laws of the universe are the same, both in nature and morals; that duty and chemistry correspond, as face to face in a mirror; that man does by knowledge what stones do by structure; that sentiment and will work in nature as irresistible laws. He starts from what is probably a philosophical error; he advances by means of a play on the word law, as though laws of mathematics, of Nature, and of morality, were *in pari materiâ*; and reaches a result which is deplorable in itself, and strikingly illustrates the danger which metaphysical enquiry possesses for illogical minds. To him it appeared that Nature was the unconscious expression, man the conscious development of the Universal Spirit; and that man is its channel of communication, and Nature its dumb manifestation. He regarded this Universal Spirit, this Over-soul as subject and object, things seen and acts of seeing, spectacle and seer; as the supreme critic of the past, the only prophet of the future; as the essence of genius, of virtue, of life, of beauty, of goodness.

By

By falling back upon our instincts we can, he argued, each for ourselves read the horoscope of the ages that are past and are to come. Through the instincts God still speaks, and has never ceased to speak to man. His revelation is not insular, limited, historical; it is universal, inexhaustible, perennial. The American of to-day stands in the same original relation to God as the Hebrew of antiquity. Each man therefore is a law to himself, for God is in him, and he may, by absolute self-surrender to that primary wisdom which we call instinct, become not only God-like, but God. 'The simplest person, who in his integrity worships God, becomes God.' Those who most perfectly obey the laws and conditions of their being enjoy the greatest measure of inspiration, because the walls of the senses are overthrown, and God's breath moves freely without let or hindrance. It is this absolute obedience to a higher nature, this perfect harmony of being that, in Emerson's view, made Jesus Christ the most inspired of seers and sages; but His inspiration differs in degree only, and not in mode or kind, from that of Moses, Zoroaster, or Socrates.

To this insecure and dreary anchorage Emerson had struggled after leaving the Second Church at Boston. In its complete form, his theory was the fruit of much meditation, both in Europe and among the woods or ponds of Concord, and of eager study of ancient philosophers and their followers. Our present purpose is not to criticize his view of life, but to show how it aided him to acquire his unrivalled influence over his fellow-countrymen.

Emerson was not studious of system, but his Creed is no mere negation; it is a genuine belief. All that he says upon the subject bears the stamp of sincerity. He is above the mean-nesses of literary combat. His soul is in his gospel, and he writes as if the fate of empires trembled on his syllables. He does not preach the experience of another acquired at second-hand, and vamped up with literary artifices to wear the appearance of novelty. Though it may have cost his peculiar temperament comparatively little to reach this vantage ground, he yet has struggled, and has himself passed through an ordeal. It was the perpetual source of his fresh enthusiasm and buoyant optimism, for if all regenerative power is within the soul itself, there is no need of the slow processes of evolution. The transformation of the world may be to-morrow, nay, even at this very hour. It inspired his indestructible faith in humanity, his infectious confidence in the future of America. He is convinced that the moral government of the world is divine, and that, in spite of all obstructions, man still pursues an onward, upward march. Every human being, however degraded, was an im-  
prisoned



prisoned soul struggling to be free. And this conviction he has expressed with characteristic exaggeration in the saying, 'The carrion in the sun will soon convert itself to grass and flowers; and man, wherever thou seest him, whether on gibbets or in brothels, is on his way to all that is great and good.' It fostered his spirit of intellectual and religious independence. The 'moral sentiment' is in his opinion the basis of all religion, and he urges the world to return to that foundation. He has all a democrat's jealousy of any exclusive claim to revelation, and he taught his countrymen to pay no false complaisance to reigning schools or the wisdom of antiquity. Let each scholar respect himself, stand on his own methods, and accomplish his own work. 'Our day is come, we have been born out of the eternal silence; and now will we live—live for ourselves—and not as the pall-bearers of a funeral, but as the upholders and creators of our age.' 'Frater,' said Augustine, 'noli putare te ipsam esse lucem.' No! cries Emerson, strength and light are in yourselves. 'We too must write Bibles.' His theory made him a democrat and a champion of republican institutions, for his doctrine of self-reliance taught him to believe that all men were capable of self-government. Holding as he did that America had her own individual part to play in the development of the common weal of nations, he was both national and patriotic. On the other hand, he was cosmopolitan and catholic. Climate, race, colour weighed as feathers in his scales, beside the man himself. Believing that Absolute Truth exists nowhere save in the universal mind where all things are one, he was Catholic in his acceptance of new ideas, in the stores of wisdom which he accumulated from east and west, from England, Germany, and Greece. He was also untrammelled in his freedom; he was required to found no school of philosophy, to construct no system, to formulate no dogmatic beliefs, since no thought could comprehend, no system contain, no religion express, more than a partial version of truth. Finally it fanned his love of Nature into a steady flame of raptuous passion. Musing on the resemblances between man and the outer world, reading in Nature's marvels analogies with his own higher self, studying in her laws the moral laws of humanity, he bathes his eyes in her light, exults in her triumphs, strains his ear to catch the music of her harmonies; he loses himself in her woods and among her mountains that he may there discover the union between himself and her. And Nature rewards his enthusiasm by furnishing his most beautiful illustrations, suggesting his subtlest imaginations, inspiring him with poetic insight, and, clasping him to her breast, warms into life his frosty intellect.

Emerson's creed is difficult to formulate, because it was not intended to be systematic. He claimed to be a seer, not an architect. He himself warns us not to 'set the least value on what I do, or the least discredit to what I do not, as if I pretended to settle anything true or false. I unsettle all things. No facts are to me sacred; none are profane; I simply experiment, an endless seeker, with no past at my back.' But the points on which we have dwelt run like threads of fire through the web of his loosely-woven philosophy. His teaching was superficially antagonistic to the needs of the people, but essentially, in many respects, it exactly met the requirements of a young nation, dwarfed by the mighty literature of the past, fearful of its own judgment, masking its scepticism under adherence to forms, fettered by a mechanical theology, sensational metaphysics, and utilitarian ethics. Emerson saw that men move in masses, in crowds, in herds; they think and observe by routine; their orbit of thoughts is defined and circumscribed within a circle. He scorned the idea that the field of thought was already foreclosed, or that his contemporaries were born the slaves of alien opinion or of foreign custom. He strove to animate their moral courage, to induce them to think for themselves, and to use the achievements of past ages, not as fetters to freedom, but as instruments of fuller activity. He hoped that if once he could break down the despotism of modes, dogmas, schools—if he could but create the spirit of self-reliance—he would set the New World spinning on the path of progress.

The key note which he struck was taken up with enthusiasm. The public mind had been long prepared for the reception of the intuitional philosophy. Men were accepted as prophets in the New World, while England was doubtful of their credentials as thinkers. Coleridge was, as he said himself, a great philosopher in America, though he was only a poor poet in England. America discovered the powers of Carlyle, while he was still without honour in his own country. Emerson in 1834 wrote a preface to an American edition of 'Sartor Resartus,' which was sold before the various portions of the work had been gathered by any English publisher from the scattered pages of 'Fraser's Magazine.' The romantic side of the movement is locally represented in Transcendentalism. Dickens, when in Boston, was given to understand that 'whatever was unintelligible would certainly be transcendental;' but he recognizes in those who belonged to this new sect 'a hearty disgust of cant,' and adds, significantly enough, 'if I were a Bostonian, I would be a Transcendentalist.' The enthusiasts of the movement differed on every topic except opposition to the old

old school. Some rejected, some ignored, all philosophy; others planted themselves on their instincts, and waited for the huge world to come round them. So diverse were their opinions that they were ironically called 'the Brotherhood of the Like-minded.' 'There was,' says Emerson, 'no concert. Perhaps they only agreed in having fallen upon Coleridge and Wordsworth, and Goethe, then on Carlyle, with pleasure and sympathy.'

Some of the youthful vagaries of those who pursued the True and the Beautiful, who said, when snow fell, 'I snow,' or, in a shower, 'I rain,' were foolish enough. They may be left to the keen lash of Lowell, Hawthorne, and Holmes. Lowell's severe judgment on Margaret Fuller has been often quoted from the 'Fable for Critics.' Nathaniel Hawthorne laughs gently at the absurdities of the movement in his 'Celestial Railroad,' in which Giant Transcendentalism, a huge amorphous monster, speaking an unintelligible language, displaces Giant Pope and Giant Despair. Their excesses and extravagances provoked the caustic satire of Oliver Wendell Holmes:—

'With uncouth words they tire their tender lungs,  
The same bald phrases on their hundred tongues;  
"Ever," the "Ages" in their page appear;  
"Alway" the bedlamite is called a "Seer";  
On every leaf the "earnest" sage may scan,  
Portentous bore! their "many-sided" man,  
A weak eclectic, groping, vague, and dim,  
Whose every angle is a half-starved whim,  
Blind as a mole, and curious as a lynx,  
Who rides a beetle which he calls a "Sphinx";  
And, oh! what questions, asked in club-foot rhyme,  
Of Earth the tongueless, and the deaf-mute Time!  
Here babbling insight shouts in Nature's ears  
His last conundrum on the orbs and spheres;  
There Self-Inspection sucks its little thumb,  
With "Whence am I?" and "Wherefore did I come?"  
Deluded Infants! will they ever know  
Some doubts must darken o'er this world below,  
Though all the Platos of the nursery trail  
Their "clouds of glory" at the go-cart's tail?'

The two most salient features in the Transcendental movement, the foundation of the 'Dial' and the organization of Brook Farm, are too closely connected with Emerson to be left unnoticed.

The 'Dial' was, in one sense, the short-lived periodical of a literary group in Boston, for the local transcendentalism was little more than this. Carlyle complained of the Magazine as unpractical, without anchorage in this present universe.

Emerson replies that it was so, because 'all bright boys and girls in New England, quite ignorant of each other, take the world so.' This answer indicates the real interest of the 'Dial.' It was not merely the organ of a *coterie*, but the representative of a fresh, indigenous, and thoroughly American movement. Through all the vapours of idealism shine, brightly enough, faith in ideas, belief in objects higher than those of sense, strenuous assertion of the principle, that the forms of one age are inadequate to express the wants of another, the conviction that commercial prosperity is not the only, or the highest, beatitude of man. The prospectus of the Magazine was issued in May, 1840. It was continued quarterly down to April, 1844. For the first two years it was edited by Margaret Fuller, and after April, 1842, by Emerson. The first volume contains, among other articles, a mystical novel entitled, 'Ernest the Seeker'; the 'Orphic Sayings' of Alcott, and 'Glimmerings,' by some other seer; essays on 'Ideals in every-day Life,' 'The Act of Life,' 'The Divine Presence in Nature and in the Soul,' 'The Religion of Beauty'; original poetry on such subjects as 'The Sphinx,' 'The Ideal,' 'The True in Dreams'; reviews of Jouffroy's 'Introduction to Ethics,' of Menzel's German Literature, with a special article on his view of Goethe, and of Brownson's writings, with particular reference to his religious novel, 'Charles Elwood, or the Converted Infidel.' This epitome affords a fair sample of the general spirit and miscellaneous character of the contents. It is a Pantheon, where its worshippers meet to read Hindu mythology and Chinese Ethics, or sing hymns to Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates, Goethe, Kant, Fichte, and Schelling. It contains much panegyric, if not rhapsodical, criticism, the tone of which is admirably caught by Lowell in the Biglow Papers, where Parson Wilbur provides, among his press notices, a review taken from the 'World-Harmonic-Æolian-Attachment.' The fantastic spirit of German romance breathes through many of the pages, and the most solid sense is to be found in the vigorous articles of Theodore Parker. Emerson contributed largely to the 'Dial'; some of his best known poetry is to be found in its columns. But his letter to Carlyle seems to indicate the paternal attitude which he assumed towards the 'bright boys and girls' who filled its pages, and he habitually spoke of it as 'Margaret Fuller's' magazine. Yet even the shallow affectation of its Orientalism and the vague obscurity of its mystic aspirations, were not without use as a protest against the tyranny of materialism.

The mutiny took yet wilder shapes. The Brook Farm Experiment

iment proves the dominance of the utilitarian school, and the despair of those who had faith in something beyond exchanges, and believed that the possession of ideas transcended the wealth of millionaires. It was an attempt to reconcile labour, capital, and culture, partly based on Fourierism, but still more on the general impulse to universal reform. In 1842, 'avec une naïveté ravissante,' a number of educated persons left the 'world of institutions,' and reconstructed 'the social order from new beginnings' at Brook Farm. George Ripley was the founder of the Association. It failed financially and socially. Hawthorne has suspended from it one of his finely-woven idealized romances, and in his note-book has recorded his own experiences as a farm apprentice. No one who has once read will ever forget his initiation into the art of milking, and his prayer to heaven that he might not be allotted Miss Margaret Fuller's Transcendental heifer, 'which is very fractious, and apt to kick over the milk-pail.' But, apart from the literary interest of the experiment, Brook Farm remains a striking episode in the history of the Transcendental movement in America. 'Not a reading man in the community,' wrote Emerson in 1840, 'but has a draft of a new community in his waistcoat pocket.' Yet when, in 1841, he was asked to join the experiment, he refused. He was 'resolved to live cleanly,' but he was only 'gently mad' himself. He was keenly alive to the comic aspect of this paradise of shepherds and shepherdesses, which he describes as 'a perpetual picnic, a French Revolution in small, an Age of Reason in a patty-pan.' Elsewhere he says that the married women were against it. 'The common school was well enough, but to the common nursery they had grave objections. Eggs might be hatched in ovens, but the hen on her account preferred the old way. A hen without her chickens is but half a hen.' Considerable pressure was put upon Emerson to join the Association. It was hinted that his abstention might ruin the experiment. His letter of refusal brings out clearly the shrewd practical good sense of the Transcendental philosopher:—

'I am in many respects placed as I wish to be . . . I cannot accuse my townsmen or my neighbours of my domestic grievances, only my own sloth and conformity. It seems to me a circuitous and obverse way of relieving myself to put upon your community the emancipation which I ought to take upon myself.

'The institution of hired service is to me very disagreeable. I should like to come one step nearer nature than this usage permits. But surely I need not sell my house and remove my family to Newton in order to make the experiment of labour and self-help. I am already in the act of trying some domestic and social experiments which would gain nothing.'

Stress

Stress has been laid upon the 'Dial' and Brook Farm for two reasons. In them is concentrated the scanty romance of Emerson's career, and they afford the opportunity to insist upon his real attitude towards a local phase of the Transcendental movement, with which his name is often exclusively and prejudicially associated. The æsthetic mysticism of the 'Dial,' the whimsical vagary of Brook Farm, were signs of a general fermentation. Mesmerism, chiromancy, spiritualism, phrenology, animal magnetism, Marat democrats, furnished ingredients for the bubbling cauldron. Alcott's 'potato gospel,' or the 'Second Advent,' were only signs of a general movement which found its noblest embodiment in the abolition of slavery. In 1840-1 a convention for universal reform was assembled at Chardon Street, Boston, a motley group, to quote Emerson's own list, of 'madmen, madwomen, men with beards, Dunkers, Muggletonians, Come-outers, Groaners, Agrarians, Seventh-day Baptists, Quakers, Abolitionists, Calvinists, Unitarians, and Philosophers.' The value of a man like Emerson was at such a crisis incalculable. A recognized leader in the movement, he encouraged, while he disciplined, its enthusiasm. He preached his gospel everywhere that it is more true and noble to live than to think; he discountenanced the withdrawal from public and domestic duties; he protested against a life of mere abstraction. To the young Americans, who, educated above the work of their times, and keenly critical of their surroundings, flocked to Europe to find an object in life, he addressed himself with earnest eloquence. He pointed out the folly of a youth of noble aims finding no field for his energies, 'while the colossal wrongs of the Indian, of the negro, of the emigrant, remain unmitigated, and the religious, civil, and judicial forms of the country are confessedly effete and offensive.' His example was the exact counterpart of his precepts. A daring idealist and a worshipper of solitary Nature, he failed in none of his relations as a son, a husband, a father, a friend, a neighbour, and a citizen.

There is little to record in the remainder of Emerson's career. In 1838 he was living at Concord upon an income of about 500*l.* a year. The inmates of his home were his mother, 'whitest, mildest, most conservative of old ladies, whose only exception to her universal preference for old things is her son'; his wife Lidian, 'an incarnation of Christianity'; his son Waldo, 'a piece of love and sunshine, well worth my watching from morning to night.' In 1841 his boy died.

'You can never sympathize with me,' he wrote to Carlyle; 'you can never know how much of me such a young child can take away. A few weeks ago I accounted myself a very rich man, and now the poorest

poorest of all. What would it avail to tell you anecdotes of a sweet and wonderful boy, such as we sadden and solace ourselves with at home every morning and evening ?'

His grief proves that depths of tenderness were hidden under a passionless exterior. Nearly the last connected words which Emerson spoke on his own death-bed, forty-one years later, were, 'Oh, that beautiful boy !'

The death of his son is almost the only interruption to the serenity of his uneventful life. His fame as a teacher grew through his lectures and essays till it crossed the Atlantic. In 1847 he was invited to read a series of lectures before the Mechanics' Institutes of the Northern and Midland Counties. He accepted the invitation, and collected the results of his keen-sighted observation in the volume of 'English Traits.' Mingled with some good-humoured criticism, marred by his habitual tendency to loose generalization and exaggeration, is a generous appreciation of the national character. Some of the points, on which he dwelt with most emphasis in 1847, can be traced with difficulty in 1888. He praises the Englishman's love of plain dealing, his faith in a hand-to-hand trial of strength without trick or stratagem, his realistic application of logic, his belief in the existence of two sides to every question, his resolution to see fair play, his dislike to vapouring and sentimentalism. In Emerson's pages it was not only profitable, but pleasant, to 'see ourselves as others see us.' If that keen-sighted observer visited England to-day, what would be his impression of our shoddy manufactures, our indecision, irresolution, and sentimentalism, our cynical disavowal of fair play in politics or trade, our delight in fine phrases and vapid verbiage, our worship of the art of words for its own sake, our incapacity to apply logic as a means to a practical end ? Emerson lived to visit England a third time, but the remaining circumstances of his life present little important matter and may be rapidly dismissed.

On his return to America in 1848 Emerson resumed his lectures and literary work. He had never identified himself with narrow party questions ; but the national crisis, which led up to the Civil War, forced him more frequently on to the platform. He had been a consistent champion of negro emancipation, though his own suggestions for the solution of the difficulty were impracticably optimistic. He proposed to buy the slaves from the planters, and he expected that two thousand millions would be enthusiastically contributed for the purpose. Both in prose and verse he was an enthusiast for practical and ideal liberty. Nor was his patriotism less fervent than his philanthropy,



philanthropy, and his idealism. It was Emerson who said that John Brown of Harper's Ferry had consecrated the gallows, and who delivered the finest eulogy on the death of Lincoln. Whenever he descended from his intellectual throne to speak on grave national issues, his advice was weighty, and his utterances expressed in fewest words the aptest truths. His pithy sayings passed from mouth to mouth and could not be put aside. His influence widened as men learned to value, not only the brilliancy of his intellect, but the balance of his judgment. In 1872, his house, which he had occupied for thirty-six years, was burnt down. It was rebuilt by his fellow-townsmen during his third absence in England; but his nerves never recovered the shock. The following year he was nominated for the Lord Rectorship of Glasgow University, and polled 500 votes against the 700 recorded for Lord Beaconsfield.

Towards the close of his life his mind and memory began to fail. When Mr. Moncure Conway met him at Longfellow's funeral, his mind was almost a wreck. Twice he rose from his seat, looked earnestly at the poet's familiar features, and finally said to a friend at his side, 'That gentleman was a sweet beautiful soul, but I have entirely forgotten his name.' A few weeks later, on the 27th of April, 1882, Emerson died.

Emerson's undoubted influence in suggesting thought and inspiring noble ideals of life has been already considered. This power constitutes, in our opinion, his highest title to fame. But it remains also to consider Emerson's more permanent claims to immortality as a poet, a philosopher, and a writer. Specialists will probably dispute his title in each respective field. But, in our opinion, he cannot be excluded from any one of the three categories.

In a recent number of this 'Review,'\* we indicated our view of Emerson's rank among the poets of his country and of the century. We have little to add to that criticism, to which the reader is referred. It would be a thankless task to dwell on the obvious faults of a verse writer, whose poetical insight and rich suggestiveness are patent and undeniable. His poetry is of the head rather than of the heart; ideas not actual life, man not men, are his province. He has no studies of character, and never writes of events. His sympathies are high and narrow, rather than broad and deep. On the other hand his peculiar gifts are delicate appreciation of the sentiment of nature, perception of spiritual analogies and correspondencies, subtlety of insight into the problems of human destiny. But he remains, in our

\* October, 1887. 'American Poetry,' pp. 377-8.

opinion, rather poetical than a poet. As he philosophized like a poet, so he wrote verse like a philosopher. His poetry, in fact, consists either of description, or of speculation. In this latter field it is the distillation of his prose philosophy. The four lines from his 'Voluntaries' breathe the very essence of his teaching both in prose and verse :—

'So nigh is grandeur to our dust,  
So near is God to man,  
When Duty whispers low, *Thou must*,  
The youth replies, *I can.*'

The poetical specialist denies Emerson's claim to be a poet, and the philosophical specialist equally disputes his title of a great thinker. If continuity or system are essential to thought Emerson cannot pass muster. His philosophy marks, but does not make, an epoch. No one was more keenly alive to his inconsequence than himself. In his *Journal* he wrote :—

'If Minerva offered me a gift and an option, I would say, Give me continuity. I am tired of scraps. I do not wish to be a literary or intellectual *chiffonnier*. Away with the Jew's rag-bag of ends and tufts of brocade, velvet, or cloth-of-gold, and let me spin some yards or miles of helpful twine; a clew to lead to one kingly truth; a cord to bind wholesome and belonging facts.'

The position of a philosopher has been claimed for him by his admirers, but it is one which Emerson never claimed for himself. To him system savoured of charlatanism. He is only a philosopher in the broad sense in which the words may be used of Montaigne. He was in fact thoroughly imbued with the philosophical spirit, but he abjured system because it narrowed sympathies, and he admired Plato because his balanced soul could see the different sides of every question. His own thought is in a perpetual state of flux; he recognises good in idealists and realists, in Transcendentalists and universal sceptics, in men of action and Oriental mystics. Each had seized and embodied some portion of truth. A mind so constituted might be philosophical, but it does not belong to the philosopher.

He was a man of independent, rather than original, thought; he combines rather than invents. Perhaps this form of originality is the only form still open to the heirs of the ages. He defends plagiarism, because 'As every house is a quotation out of all forests and mines and stone quarries, so every man is a quotation from all his ancestors.' He depreciates so-called originality, and considered that assimilating power, as distinct from assimilating knack, differentiates the man of genius from the man of talent. The inventor alone knows how to borrow.

His

His own practice illustrates his remark. With Catholic eclecticism he passes through the crucible of his mind ideas of all ages and every clime; but they emerge from the process changed, modernized, and adapted to the wants of a New World. He deals with the familiar counters of thought; but they bear new values and are stamped with his own superscription. He sets up no new, and destroys no old, landmarks of philosophy, but all are shifted. He neither followed nor founded a school; he uses the language and thinks the thoughts of all, but he adopts the views of none. As with his intellectual process, so with his intellectual influence. It is impossible to tell his followers by their literary walk. He held aloof from Emersonian Societies, and urged every man to preserve his own individuality. Hence his general influence on literary aim, character, or style, cannot be traced. He was a source of living energy in wide fields of thought; but while Curtis, Clough, Margaret Fuller, Higginson, Lowell, Sterling, Theodore Parker, Thoreau, Winthrop, and Whitman, acknowledged their debt to Emerson, none of them became his imitators.

He presents his thoughts in broken lights, attempts to excogitate no system, habitually sacrifices unity to richness of detail. He proposes no object, sustains no argument, gives the *pros* and *cons* with the same apparent earnestness. Beyond the points, on which we insisted in the earlier portions of this article, it is difficult to be sure of his general drift. Like Nature, he is one thing to-day, another to-morrow; his conceptions vary with his moods. He declares himself free of the universe, and condemns a foolish consistency as the hobgoblin of little minds. He claims and freely exercises the right to contradict himself. He opens upon his readers flashes of startling conjecture, and sallies forth in one direction, often only to re-appear in the opposite. 'I delight,' he says, 'in telling what I think; but if you ask me why I dare say so, or why it is so, I am the most helpless of mortals.' He called himself an idealist, his enemies called him a mystic: in our opinion he is neither. He is not a Platonic idealist, for he prefers ecstasy to dialectics, reveres the Oriental mind, and believes in the ineffable union of God and man in every act of the soul. Neither is he a mystic in the ordinary sense of the word; for not only does he, like many mystics, despise theurgy, but he also disdains authority, denounces fatalism, and vehemently asserts individuality. But his view of Nature combines elements of both schools. He idealizes physical science into religion. He regards evolution as the supreme law of Nature, and the production of higher forms

forms of life, the 'man-child' that is to be 'the summit of the whole' as its final cause. But of the primordial Power which thus directs every change towards progress, he affirms nothing. God was one of his ideas; but he held it to be impossible to find logical proof of physical facts. 'The spiritual is its own evidence.'

It would be an idle task to attempt what Emerson himself never attempted, and build up a consistent scheme of Emersonian philosophy. The value of his thought consists, not in system, or in Idealism, or in Pantheism, but in subtle suggestiveness, fertilizing and stimulating influences, unvarying affinities with all that is noble and true, and that happy combination of spiritual forces which leaves us more hopeful of the future, and more contented in the present. But two points may appear to call for brief mention,—his attitude towards religion, and his relation towards Carlyle.

On the first point some misconception exists. Emerson regarded Christianity as the most wonderful fact of history; but he traced its origin to a sentiment of trust in the Eternal which belongs to no age or race. Hence he refused to accept its historical basis. He treats claims of authority as challenges to his personal freedom, and, in order to assert his independence, rides rough-shod over convictions which are cherished by thousands. But his general tone towards religion is, on the whole, essentially reverent. Sometimes he assumes an air of patronage towards sacred subjects, and treats sacred names with a flippant disrespect; but these exceptions are rather faults of style and manner than of mind or heart. From the Puritans he differed essentially, yet he respects their grim earnestness and hovers respectfully about their retiring footsteps. He was very far from orthodox, yet he acknowledged the vital truth of the principles of Christianity. 'I believe,' he says, 'the Christian religion to be profoundly true,—true to an extent that they who are styled its most orthodox defenders have never, or but once or twice in a lifetime, reached. I am for the principles; they are for the men.' He believed that truth was narrowed by religious dogmas; his object was to expand and unfold the beauty of the flowers that seemed to him to lie petrified in stony traditions. Even had he believed Christianity to be a delusion, he would have been slow to declare his loss of faith.

'It were needless, perhaps mischievous, to shock the settled faith of others. Let them gradually find out the defect, and not perhaps till new and real stays and supports shall appear to take their place. No good man vaunts disbelief, but only aims to put a real motive and law in the place of the false ones removed.'

Carlyle

Carlyle and Emerson invited comparison by editing each other's works ; but they should rather be contrasted than compared. Both are dreamers, but Emerson is an optimist, Carlyle a pessimist. Both were Transcendentalists in philosophy, and here Carlyle is strongest, while Emerson is weakest. Emerson misses his mark, because he aims too wide. Carlyle, on the other hand, strikes with tremendous force to the core of the subject. Carlyle shunned, Emerson studied, all the practical movements of the day. Emerson desired freedom in the abstract, Carlyle cared only that men should be strongly governed. Carlyle detested shams, but he did not share Emerson's passion for genuineness. Emerson advocated human development through liberty, Carlyle under authority. The one is quick to discover, the other to disparage, new genius. Emerson exhorts to self-reliance, Carlyle to hero-worship ; the one is hopeful, the other despondent, of human potentialities. Emerson looks forward with calm confidence to the future ; he believes that a noble nation may ennoble the ballot-box ; he never advocates reaction, or despairs of reform and progress. Carlyle instinctively dwells on the dark side of things, and buries his gift of prophecy in the grave of history. His almost savage strength of feeling sank into the moroseness of despair ; sombre, melancholy, without faith in his mission, and hopeless of credence, he is the merciless, yet pitiful, revealer of folly to itself ; his humour is tragic in its pathos ; the past is his only solace, and scorn the only styptic for his bleeding heart. Both are in a sense biographers. Carlyle is a great artist working out the character of his hero in action, detesting abstractions and delighting in details and dates, painting a life portrait with a barbaric strength of colouring, and filling in his canvas with scenery, costume, and accessories. Emerson is not a colourist, but a generaliser and abstract thinker ; he never groups or colours, or shows his figures in moving life, but he seizes upon the central idea, which dominated the man and his work, and proceeds outwards from cause to effect, barely touching the external life of his subject. He is not a painter, but a sculptor ; still life and repose are his province. Emerson is statuesque, Carlyle picturesque ; the one soliloquizes, the other dramatizes. In style again they are essentially different. Carlyle is incomplete, fragmentary, and often grotesque. Emerson is easy, graceful, and sometimes self-complacent. Carlyle's meteoric flashes are wild and grand ; Emerson's cabinet of gems is coldly finished, and exquisitely polished. In character again they differ. Emerson is patient, enduring, suave ; Carlyle is impatient, domineering, aggressive. The one practised,

practised, the other preached, the duty not to argue with the inexorable. Emerson reached his serene vantage-ground apparently without an effort, Carlyle's desperate struggles never lift him from the valley of the shadow of death.

Is Emerson a great writer? Here, too, specialists in style might deny his title. His epigrams, aphorisms, and antitheses, are terse, trenchant, penetrating; but they require relief. A continuity of electric shocks becomes wearisome, and perpetual jerks create a longing for repose. The same inability or disinclination to create artistic wholes, which is the flaw both in his poetry and his philosophy, mars the beauty of his prose style. Taken separately, his sentences are exquisitely finished by a master of language, but in combination they are as scrappy as patchwork. Emerson is at no pains to weave a perfect robe for his thought: he is content with a book of patterns. But critics are apt to forget that the form of expression is perfectly adapted to the matter. His style lacks continuity, because his thought is not consecutive, nor his method dialectical. His object is to convey a portion of some truth with such point, as to compel us to think on the remainder. He does not employ the methods of logic, and rarely condescends to give reasons. He refuses to prove, and is content to announce; he never explains, but trusts to affirmations. His sentences convey detached observations, independent propositions, sweeping generalizations; each stands on its own merits, each must be taken by itself. He works by surprises. He startles and excites, but he does not teach; and he loves paradox, contradiction, exaggeration, because they are the best weapons for his purpose. Other defects in his style may be similarly explained, though they deserve to be more strongly reprehended. He has the '*curiosa felicitas*' of quotation which belonged to Sir Thomas Brown, and, like him, he is one of those wayward fitful thinkers who suggest reflection under what seems an idle play of the imagination. But his allusions are often far-fetched and even pedantic. He is not always scrupulous of his means to arrest attention. Thus he resorts to a studied quaintness of language, violates grammatical rules, defies idiomatic proprieties, outrages the natural meaning or collocation of words. Eager to be epigrammatic, he is sometimes only 'smart'; more rarely he violates moderation and decorum; here and there he is flippantly irreverent. But these defects are only occasional flaws in pages of brilliant writing.

Emerson's method of working encouraged the broken and fragmentary form of this style. He jotted down his separate perceptions,

perceptions, quotations, and reflections which his reading suggested in commonplace books. When he wrote on any given subject, he worked up the material which he had thus collected. Hence his essays resemble a necklace of half-strung pearls, a faintly-patterned mosaic of detached gems and crystals of aphorism. The practice seemed to grow upon him. 'Nature,' his first published work, is his most finished and systematic treatise; it also affords the best illustration of his more continuous style. His later essays are condensed, not exuberant, austere rather than florid, no longer picturesque or emotional, but intellectual and oracular.

Emerson is a brilliant essayist. His stream of thought, fresh in expression, pure in fancy, limpid in phrase, flows through pages that gleam with the sparkling products of penetrating insight, and glow with the golden fruit of varied reading. His aphorisms compress into a pointed phrase masses of keen observation, and show rare powers of drawing new lessons from life, and special gifts of distilling their essence into shrewd saws. His essays form a medley of strikingly original thought and paradoxical conundrums, facts and sophisms, truisms and revelations. Here a page of 'Proverbial philosophy' is followed by a page of poetry which is lit up with fine moral distinctions, and sentences which burn themselves in upon the memory. His criticism is often unsurpassed for its penetration, but, like all his work, it is singularly unequal. His passion for epigrams too often betrays him into exaggeration, his impatience of reservations into caricature, his parade of independence into violence. As he has no defined ethical ideas, so he has no well-marked critical standard. The want not only mars his style, but vitiates his judgments.

A teacher with unequalled power of inspiration, a poet with rare gifts of imaginative insight, a subtly suggestive thinker, a writer whose phrases have enriched the proverbial currency of the world, a brilliant essayist, and a penetrating critic, Emerson is, on the whole, the most striking figure in the American republic of letters. Totally without hypocrisy he conceals nothing from the world, and pretends to no belief which he does not sincerely hold. If on the one side he appears rash, superficial, inconsistent, inconclusive; on the other, he is courageous, comprehensive, bracing, practical. Everything which he said or wrote was inspired by the noblest purpose. His voice was always heard on the side of Truth, Justice, and Liberty. To English readers he will never become a classic because of his aggressive independence, but all can value his  
love



love of truth and his lofty ideal of moral beauty. Many years ago, Matthew Arnold wrote a sonnet on Emerson's Essays, which complains of the neglect of his teaching.

"O monstrous, dead, unprofitable world,  
That thou canst hear, and hearing, hold thy way.  
A voice oracular hath peal'd to-day,  
To-day a hero's banner is unfurl'd.  
Hast thou no welcome?" So I said.  
Man after man, the world smil'd and pass'd by;  
A smile of wistful incredulity,  
As though one spoke of noise unto the dead;  
Scornful, and strange, and sorrowful; and full  
Of bitter knowledge. Yet the Will is free;  
Strong is the Soul, and wise, and beautiful;  
The seeds of god-like power are in us still;  
Gods are we, Bards, Saints, Heroes, if we will.  
Dumb judges, answer, truth or mockery?'

Ordinary men resent the inadequate solution of difficulties that deems itself adequate, and feel that for a few cold intellects constituted like himself, Emerson may be a guide. His studied calm and polished embellishments of style are not the characteristics of a man, who utters burning thoughts that have consumed his own soul, or speaks of passions that he struggles to repress, or reveals truths which his mind has reached after long years of doubt and difficulty. But those who reject his moral teaching cannot fail to recognize the nobility of his example. 'I am striving with all my might,' said Plotinus, as his soul was departing, 'to return the divine part of me to the Divine Whole who fills the Universe.' This was the purpose of Emerson's life. Nor is it strange that his nation should treasure the memory of the man, who helped to throw a glow and warmth over grey realities of life, to save his countrymen from absorption in mechanical pursuits, to give the New World literary and intellectual independence, in a word, to leaven society with the elements which a young country most urgently requires. In a period of great unrest America beheld, to quote the words of Hawthorne, 'through the midnight of this moral world, his intellectual fire as a beacon burning on a hill-top, and, climbing the difficult ascent, looked forth into the surrounding obscurity more hopefully than before.'

ART. VII.—*The Cruise of the Marchesa to Kamschatka and New Guinea, with Notices of Formosa, Liu-Kiu, and various Islands of the Malay Archipelago.* By F. H. H. Guillemard, M.A., M.D. (Cantab.). Two Volumes. London, 1886.

THE Pacific Coast of Asia is in some respects the most interesting in the world. From Kamtchatka to Australia we have one long series of great island groups along the coast, and among them multitudes of islets looking on the map as if they had been scattered from a Titanic pepper-box. If the great waves of the broad Pacific have had little to do with the breaking up into fragments of the eastern border of Asia, there seems no doubt, that it is connected with the seismic forces which we find everywhere prevalent from Behring Sea to Java. Professor Judd tells us, that one hundred and fifty volcanoes exist in the chain of islands which stretch from Behring Straits down to the Antarctic circle; and, if we include the volcanoes in the Indian and Pacific Islands which appear to be situated in lines branching from this particular band, this great system of volcanic mountains includes at least one half of the habitually active craters of the globe. What is the precise relation between this enormous volcanic activity and the multitude of islands, which seem to have been broken off at one time or another from the eastern coast of Asia, we cannot undertake to say. We still know too little about the geology and natural history of these islands, of the bed of the surrounding seas, and of the real nature of volcanic action, to be justified in formulating any theory; but what we have discovered of its biology adds immensely to the interest of the archipelago. We are all indebted to the ability with which Mr. Wallace worked out this department of a great subject, in his 'Geographical Distribution of Animals' and his 'Island Life.' The resemblances and the differences that exist among the biological characteristics of the different islands and island groups, and the relations which subsist between this factor and the depths which separate the islands, introduce us to one of the most fascinating problems in the whole range of natural science. There is, for example, the marked difference between the fauna of the two little islands of Bali and Lombok, to the east of Java. These islands are separated by a strait only 15 miles broad, but they differ far more from one another in their birds and quadrupeds than do England and Japan; showing that mere distance is one of the least important of the causes, which have determined the likeness or unlikeness in the animals of different countries. In this particular case the enormous depth of 2000 fathoms, which separates the two contiguous

tiguous islands, affords a reason for the marked difference in their biological conditions. A good map of the Western Pacific, showing by different tints the soundings from 100 fathoms upwards, will exhibit the eccentric groupings of the islands to the east and south-east of Asia, from Java, or even Australia, north to Japan. At a certain moderate distance east of all the groups we find a sudden descent to the 2000 fathoms' sounding, showing apparently the limit within which changes, vertical and horizontal, have taken place since the present general relations between land and water were established. Within that limit, however, it will be seen from the soundings, combined with what we know of the physical geography and the existing biological conditions of the various islands, that there must have been great and frequent internal changes, subsidences and elevations, junctions and separations, to account for the remarkable variations which at present exist. The human problem is as curious and attractive as any which we meet with in these island groups. From the Aino and the Mongoloid in the north, to the Papuan, the Malay, and the Negrito, if not the Australoid, in the south, we have every variety of feature and physique and habit, suggesting migrations and collisions, interminglings and isolations, through the long period since man made his first appearance in these remote seas. Thus to the student of science, curious to unravel Nature's complicated problems and to trace out the lines along which she has been working through untold ages, all this irregular fringe of the Asiatic continent must have a powerful attraction. Add to this the immense variety of its scenic features, from the matchless volcanic peaks of Kamtchatka down through the eccentric charms of Japan, the fearful precipices which Formosa presents to the Pacific, the paradise of Sulu, the tropical exuberance of Borneo, Sumatra, Java, New Guinea, and their minor satellites, and this attraction becomes a fascination for any one who is not a mere dryasdust collector.

It was in and around this vastly interesting region that Dr. Guillemard had the good fortune to spend about two years in 1882-84. He was a guest on board Mr. C. T. Kettlewell's fine screw yacht, the '*Marchesa*,' of 420 tons. The wonderful development of yachting in recent years might form an interesting chapter in the history of navigation. In America we have had some magnificent specimens of yachts, both for pleasure and for racing; the former floating palaces, and the latter unmatched for speed. But England is mistress of the seas in this respect, as happily, in spite of pessimists, she still remains so far as fighting power is concerned. Yachts of all sorts

and sizes, from the deckless toy to the magnificent 1000-tonner, swarm by the hundred in all the harbours round our shores. Our summer seas are whitened with their sails and furrowed with their screws; and, when the fogs and storms of our sunless winter drive them from our waters, not a few of them spread their wings to seek for sunshine elsewhere. The Mediterranean is a great playground for the English yachtsman; and there are not many other seas all over the world where he will not be found at one season or another, from Franz Josef Land in the North to Tasmania in the South. These modern yachtsmen may, in a sense, be regarded as the lineal successors of those old privateersmen who, from the days of Columbus almost to the time of Cook, invaded the oceans of the world, finding their pleasure in plunder; just as the modern scientific expeditions have taken the place of the old naval expeditions, which did quite as much in buccaneering as exploring. For the fact is, with perhaps the exception of Halley's famous expedition in the end of the seventeenth century, our great navigators were nearly all of the true buccaneering stamp, worthy descendants of the old Norsemen, who scoured the seas of Europe, and endowed our race with that spirit of naval enterprise which has made us the greatest colonizing people of any age. The records of English navigation show that, from the sixteenth century downwards, scarcely a year passed but an expedition of some kind left our shores, many of them to America and the West Indies, others of them to the East Indies, and not a few of them round by Cape Horn into the Pacific, and westwards to those very seas, of which Dr. Guillemard tells us so much in the volumes before us. But, as we have said, until the days of Cook, science and exploration, though by no means neglected, were almost invariably subordinated to what we must call, we suppose, plunder and annexation. The scramble among the European nations for the acquisition of the rest of the world began even before the days of Columbus, and has not yet ended. Happily England was in the field early, and, happily for her, Germany had too much to do at home to think of burdening herself with foreign possessions. Let us therefore be grateful to our old friends the buccaneers who have left us masters of the seas and possessors of a Colonial Empire that can never be surpassed.

Cook's expeditions were really the first purely scientific expeditions that ever left these shores (Halley's small special expedition excepted), expeditions which happily were followed by many others of a similar type; the latest and in some respects the greatest of them being that in the 'Challenger,' the records of which are filling many quarto volumes. But apart from these

these special expeditions, much good work is done in Her Majesty's ships still to be found in every sea, not only in the way of surveying, but in scientific observation of all kinds, as the records of our learned societies tell us, and as may be seen in such books as that recently published by Surgeon-Major Guppy on the Solomon Islands.

It is with yachts as it is with ships of the British Navy; some of them leave our shores with no very definite purpose but to cruise at large, their owners finding their pleasure in the mere delight of being afloat, or in visiting many shores and islands, and seeing the ways of strange peoples. The too-fascinating story told by the 'Earl and the Doctor' in 'South Sea Bubbles,' and the late Lady Brassey's well-known 'Voyage of the Sunbeam,' may be taken as types of the class; not that, so far as we can remember, 'the Earl and the Doctor' had a regularly equipped yacht of their own; but their lounging cruise among the Pacific fairy lands was of the true pleasure-yachting type. The voyage described in Lady Brassey's book may, however, be taken as representative of the normal yachting pleasure-trip. As a rule, outlandish places are not much sought after, and uncouth and dangerous interiors are avoided. The shores of the Malay Islands may be coasted, and their beauties admired, but good harbours are always sought for, and halting-places not beyond the reach of the resources of civilization. The distance traversed is often a thing to boast of in connection with this class of voyage, as in the case of the 'Wanderer,' which in 1880-82 managed to cover 44,890 geographical miles. In the case of Mr. Knight's 'Cruise of the Falcon,' in 1884, one of the great features of its voyages, in which, however, some good work was done, was that the yacht was only an 18-tonner. Books recording cruises of this class are becoming rather too common; they are generally dreary, and their observations of the most commonplace kind; though even in well-frequented routes, like the islands of the Ægean, a good observer may see and hear much that would be new to the majority of readers.

Of the scientific yachting cruise, we regret to say, we have not many examples; and certainly none in their results can be compared with the 'Cruise of the Marchesa.' Lamont and Leigh Smith, though sport was a prominent object in their voyages to the Spitzbergen Seas, employed themselves in scientific observation; and Mr. Leigh Smith has had the honour of tracing Franz Josef Land far to the north, and of having risked his life in the cause of science. Sir Allen Young, moreover, did some very creditable work on the other side of the Arctic, in the yacht 'Pandora,' which, under its new name, the 'Jeannette,' came

to so disastrous an ending in the seas to the north of Behring Strait. But the 'Cruise of the Marchesa' stands out prominently from all other yachting voyages on record. Its story, as told by Dr. Guillemard, deserves to take high rank, even as a literary production; while as a contribution to science it may fairly be classed with Professor Moseley's 'Notes of a Naturalist in the Challenger.' It is rare indeed to find any one so well qualified as Dr. Guillemard, not only to take full advantage of the exceptional opportunity offered in the 'Cruise of the Marchesa' for scientific observation, but to describe the results in a style that would do credit to an experienced and trained literary artist. Dr. Guillemard, though a young man, seems to have travelled nearly all over the world; but, so far as we know, this is his first book. Its readers will wish that it may not be his last.

Dr. Guillemard's book must be distinguished from the ordinary yachting narrative, and placed in the class to which the works of Bates, Wallace, Belt, and Moseley, belong. The 'Marchesa,' during her two years' cruising in the East, touched at many places besides those with which Dr. Guillemard's narrative deals: at Ceylon, Singapore, Hongkong, Yokohama, and other familiar places; but Dr. Guillemard passes these in silence, or with a bare reference. Had he followed the usual course, his book might have been equally interesting, but it would have been twice its present size. We have had many accounts of the places we have mentioned, but a man with Dr. Guillemard's power of observation and scientific thought would probably have been able to exhibit them in aspects not quite obvious to the ordinary traveller. As an example of this superior power of observation we need only refer to Haeckel's charming little work on Ceylon, and to the chapters relating to Japan in Nordenskjöld's 'Voyage of the Vega.' Men like Dr. Guillemard should take up the work of exploration; we have had enough of mere pioneer work, useful and necessary as it is. We have obtained a general idea of the features of continents and oceans; in Africa, in Central Asia, in Australia, and South America, lines have been run in all directions, and it is now time that the meshes of the network thus formed should be filled up by men like Dr. Guillemard, competent for the work.

At a recent meeting of the Royal Geographical Society a paper was read, describing the two years' journey of Mr. A. D. Carey through Central Asia. Mr. Carey sojourned for some time in one of the most interesting regions of the globe, so far as science is concerned; but he brought back nothing which could, in the least, help us to solve any of the problems which  
cluster

cluster round this region. His narrative was little more than an itinerary, no doubt valuable enough in its way. We do not blame Mr. Carey; he did not undertake his journey in the interests of science, but simply as a holiday trip; but had a man like Dr. Guillemard been in his place, what a different story he would have had to tell! From Africa we have recently heard much of the Kilimanjaro region, abounding with interest for the geographer and the biologist. Explorer after explorer has coquetted with the snow-capped mountain, and several have attempted, with more or less success, to reach its summit. Zoologists and botanists have told us, that the region ought to furnish some rare spoils to science; but it is only the other day that any one has gone there with eyes trained to discover them. The result is as novel as if a venturesome explorer had returned with a collection of the bird and insect life to be found on another planet. For enterprising young men, with an ambition to do good work for science, and desirous of obtaining the practical training indispensable for the highest kind of research, there is an ample field and comparatively little risk in Africa, in Asia, and in the region about which Dr. Guillemard tells us so much. In Dr. Guillemard's case, his book shows what can be done in a mere yachting voyage. We should say, however, that he deals mostly with the more popular aspect of his observations; much of the scientific results have been communicated to the learned societies.

Dr. Guillemard wastes no time in preliminaries, and at page 2 we find ourselves cruising along the towering cliffs of Formosa, an island about which, though known to Europeans for some three centuries, we have still much to learn. There are some strange romances connected with it, as may be seen by any one who cares to look into the old collections. The west and more level part of the island is fairly well known, but the interior and the eastern half, whose mountain recesses are wholly given over to the aborigines, is almost totally unexplored. How full of strange interest it is, will be seen from what Dr. Guillemard tells us of the matchless precipices of the east coast, rising some of them 7000 feet, almost perpendicularly, from the water's edge. Dr. Guillemard was daring enough to land at a gorge on this forbidding coast, but everywhere it seemed to be dominated by impassable precipices, though on his return he and his companions were a little excited to come across the footprints of native feet that were not there when they previously landed. The fact is, these native Formosans are as dangerous savages as are to be found, and every year not a few of the inhabitants on the Chinese or western side fall victims to their temerity in venturing



ing to cross the border. The natives of the western half of the island have distinctly Malay features, and their language belongs to the Malay stock; and a similar element is evident in the wild tribes of the interior, though a strong Negrito mixture is probable. Even the Formosan hat, Dr. Guillemard tells us, is of Malay origin. How full of interest is the history of this island for the ethnologist, may be seen from the learned brochure recently issued by Dr. Terrien de Lacouperie, under the title of 'Formosa Notes,' in which the Chinese connection with the island is traced as far back as the seventh century, and the existence of a strong Negrito element in the population is clearly established. For any one venturous enough there is here an almost virgin field for exploration, though, as Dr. Guillemard hints, it is more than doubtful whether the results of the explorer's experiences would ever be given to the world. Dr. Guillemard refers to some of the interesting geographical and biological problems connected with Formosa. Thus the soundings in the channel, which separates the island from the coast of China, give evidence of a submarine bank of only 20 to 40 fathoms deep; while, on the eastern side, soundings of a thousand fathoms or more are found within a very short distance of the shore. Formosa 'thus formed the eastern limit of the vast continent with which, at no very remote geological period, the islands of Borneo and Sumatra were also united.' At the same time, it would seem that the very configuration of Formosa may, in turn, be the means of connecting it once more with the mainland. The rainfall of the central and northern part of the island is extremely heavy; and the gradients from the mountains to the western plain are so steep, that the erosion is excessive, and the mountains are being gradually washed westwards into the sea. A good deal of business is done at the ports of Keelung and Tamsui on the Northern coast; coal of fair quality is found, and the rich soil of the western half of the island is suited for all sorts of tropical and subtropical products. Moreover the value of the island, from a strategical point of view, is evident; no wonder then that, a few years ago, the French made a desperate attempt to establish themselves upon it, and add it to their enormous and worse than useless 'protectorate.' Fortunately for the future of this interesting island, they did not succeed. It is a curious fact connected with Formosa that, notwithstanding its proximity to and apparent former connection with China, its fauna, especially its birds and its mammals, have their closest allies in India and Sumatra. These facts, as Mr. Wallace points out, teach us first that Formosa should be classed among the recent continental islands, and also that, at the time  
of

of its connection with the mainland, the ancestors of the existing Formosan, Indian, and Malayan forms were equally dispersed throughout the intervening and at the time undivided continent.

Under Dr. Guillemard's guidance we leave Formosa, in June 1882, for the group lying between that island and Japan, whose name has such a puzzling variety of forms—*e.g.* Loo Choo—but which, with Dr. Guillemard, we shall content ourselves with calling Liu-Kiu. On many maps the Liu-Kiu islands are made to include three groups; a southern group east of the north end of Formosa, a central to the north-east, and a north group between that and the Linschoten Archipelago. It is with the central group, and the largest island in that group, Okinawa-Sima, that Dr. Guillemard mainly deals. His account of his visit is one of the most charming chapters in his book, for these quaint little Liu-Kiuans are among the most interesting survivals to be found. The islands are at last definitely recognized as belonging to Japan, and rightly so; for, though in some respects the people differ from the Japanese, they bear little or no resemblance, either in physique or customs, to the Chinese. They are even more Japanese than their masters; a sort of ideal Japanese, as it were, whom it would be a pity to spoil. As with the people, so with the islands: 'Liu-Kiu is Japan, just as the Liu-Kiuans are Japanese; but it is Japan, with its grotesqueness toned down, and its stiffness softened by six degrees of latitude.' Again, to quote Dr. Guillemard: 'The Liu-Kiuans are a short race, probably even shorter than the Japanese, but much better proportioned, being without the long bodies and short legs of the latter people, and having as a rule extremely well-developed chests. The colour of the skin varies, of course, with the social position of the individual.' Though the type resembles the Japanese, it is nevertheless very distinct. 'In Liu-Kiu the Japanese and natives were easily distinguished by us from the first, and must therefore be possessed of very considerable differences. The Liu-Kiuian has the face less flattened, the eyes are more deeply set, and the nose more prominent at its origin; the forehead is high, and the cheekbones somewhat less marked than in the Japanese; the eyebrows are arched and thick, and the eyelashes long; the expression is gentle and pleasing, though somewhat sad, and is apparently a true index of their character. The beard, when permitted to grow, is long and black, though not what would be termed thick by a European.' Indeed the portrait on p. 377, volume i., were it not for the peculiar dress and mode of arranging the hair, might very well pass for that of a European, and seems to suggest an infusion of that 'Caucasian' blood which, according to Mr. Keane,  
accounts

accounts for the decidedly European features to be found among some of the Pacific people, the New Zealanders, and the Samoans. The language of the people is evidently a form of Japanese; but in this, in their features, their customs, their architecture and their antiquities, there seems to be distinct evidence of mixture with a race quite different from the Japanese. Dr. Guillemard has therefore done good service in bringing together, into an Appendix, the substance of what is known concerning this curious people and their islands. He and his friends were privileged beyond any previous visitors, and he is therefore able to tell us much more than we can learn from the narratives of Halloran, Hall, Perry, Belcher, and others. The massive, almost Cyclopean, architecture of the walls, which enclose the houses in Napha-Kiang, is remarkable, and no less so are the formidable fortifications of Shiuri, the capital of the old kingdom,—for Liu-Kiu has no longer a king. By dint of tact and perseverance, Dr. Guillemard and his friend saw far more than any previous visitors, of the capital and of the old royal palace and other places. Dr. Guillemard's account of what he saw at Shiuri, the deserted palace of the king, the charming scenery, the lotus-ponds, and above all, the formidable fortifications, is full of interest and novelty.

'The gate of the fortress,' he tells us, 'was guarded by two fierce-looking stone lions and a diminutive Japanese of a most unwarlike aspect. On entering, we were able to realize to some extent the vast area that is included within the fortifications. It is extremely irregular in shape, and it is evident that no settled plan has been followed in the construction of the defences, which have been merely adapted to the character of the ground. Roughly speaking, however, there appear to be three lines of fortifications, with ample space between them for the manœuvring of any number of troops. Besides these, there is a perfect labyrinth of smaller walls, among which it would have been no very difficult matter to lose oneself; while the citadel within the inner line rises here and there into picturesque towers and battlements delightful to an artist's eye. The masonry is almost Cyclopean in character, and the blocks of stone are joined with wonderful accuracy. In this and other respects the work appeared to us to be considerably superior to that of the Japanese. Some of the walls, for example, are upwards of sixty feet in height, and of enormous thickness. They are built in the form of a series of inverted arches, which, doubtless, helps them greatly in sustaining the tremendous pressure of the earth behind them. In the present age of large ordnance, these wonderful defences would, of course, be reduced with the greatest ease; but in the old days of bow and arrow, and hand-to-hand fighting, they might justly have been considered impregnable.'

One may wonder what the peaceful and gentle tiny Liu-Kiuans want with such enormous fortifications; but our surprise vanishes when we read in Dr. Guillemard's Appendix the narrative of their chequered history.

The islands, themselves, as Dr. Guillemard states, are partially volcanic, and thus form one of the links in the great plutonic chain that skirts the eastern shores of Asia. Although between 300 and 400 miles distant from the mainland, they are, like Formosa, separated from it by a somewhat shallow sea. Again, as in the case of Formosa, immediately to the east, soundings of great depth have been obtained; and although at present our knowledge of the flora and fauna of the country is meagre, there is but little doubt that, at one time, connection must have existed with the mainland of Asia. Altogether there is here a tempting and almost virgin field for an enthusiastic young naturalist, who by a little tact, and by taking some trouble to learn the language, would soon ingratiate himself with the people, whose isolated ways are well worth studying. Here Dr. Guillemard found a couple of those waifs, who are everywhere to be met with in the islands that stud the bosom of the Pacific; in this case they were Americans.

After a visit to Japan, of which we are told nothing, the 'Marchesa' shaped her course for Kamtchatka, than which, in almost every respect, there could hardly be a greater contrast to sweet and sunny Liu-Kiu. In making way northwards the explorers sought, to get out of the cold southern current outside the Kuriles, and into what is commonly regarded as the northerly current of the Great Kuro Siwo ('Black Current'), the Gulf Stream of the Pacific. On most maps this current is represented as striking, in a north-easterly direction, into the Pacific, and sending a branch into Behring Strait. But Dr. Guillemard tells us that, when the 'Marchesa' got into the presumed middle of the Kuro Siwo, she encountered a southerly set. The fact is that the statements, in ordinary text-books and popular treatises, with respect to ocean currents, stand greatly in need of revision. It will probably take a generation or two yet to eradicate the notion, that the Gulf Stream of the Atlantic flows not only round the coasts of the British Islands, but onwards to Spitzbergen, and even as far as Nova Zembla. Those who have investigated the subject on the spot assure us, that this is a delusion, and that the Gulf Stream really gets no further than about Newfoundland, where it either sinks down, or is spread out like a delta, and is brought to a standstill. Recent American investigators have also proved, that many erroneous notions exist as to the  
Kuro

Kuro Siwo. It never gets within sight of Behring Strait, and some modification should be made in the delineated course of its great mass. The fact that Dr. Guillemard found the 'Marchesa' in a southerly, when she ought to have been in a northerly, drift, shows how much need there is for still further investigations. The 'Marchesa' passed over the region, where the Americans have done some good work in oceanography, and where Captain Belknap in the 'Tuscarora' found the greatest ocean depth yet recorded, 4643 fathoms, nearly 28,000 feet. This is just east of the mainland of Japan, and at no great distance; while the ocean bed rises in comparatively steep gradients to the coast, and the land surface gives, on rising, another 10,000 feet or so above the sea-level. Here then we have the greatest direct and uninterrupted ascent from the ocean bed to the crest of the land to be found anywhere; and were the water lessened by only about 100 fathoms, we should have an almost continuous land surface from the east coasts of Japan and Kamtchatka to the Asiatic mainland.

If the Kuro Siwo is supposed to modify greatly the climate of Kamtchatka, the result is not particularly creditable to its energy; for Kamtchatka is in the latitude of the British Islands, and while, with all its drawbacks, our climate is essentially temperate, that of Kamtchatka has much in common with Greenland, though the former stretches some ten degrees further south. It is altogether a strange and interesting land, more so on the whole, and from various points of view, than any of the wonderful lands into which the 'Marchesa' bears us. A glance at the map of Asia will show, that it is one of those great tongues of land which hang down from the curving eastern coast of Asia; the other two being Korea and Cochin China. Although the peninsula of Kamtchatka is connected with the mountain systems of the north-east extension of Siberia, it has many features peculiar to itself. In its wonderful volcanic action it is related to the Kuriles and to the great seismic region which extends southwards to Java. It is, indeed, for its size, one of the most active volcanic regions of our globe. In this comparatively limited area there are some forty mountains of distinct volcanic origin, while about a dozen are still active. The largest of them, Kluchefskaya, not far from the east coast, in the basin of the Kamtchatka river, reaches a height of nearly 17,000 feet. Some terrible eruptions are recorded during last century; even now it is one of the most active of these volcanoes; but, as its displays are witnessed by only a few natives and Russian settlers, we hear little about them. Only nine months after the departure of the 'Marchesa' from Kamtchatka

tchatka a series of eruptions appear to have taken place, which in grandeur must have recalled those of 1737. Although described in the 'Japan Gazette,' and although contemporaneous with the stupendous eruption of Krakatau, no notice seems to have been taken of them in Europe. From the description he received, Dr. Guillemard concludes, that it must have been Kluchefskaya that burst forth. The cone is said to have suddenly split in two, emitting immense quantities of lava, which poured down its slopes. The mountain was in active eruption throughout the whole of July, the pillar of flame in calm weather being distinctly visible at distances of from 200 to 250 miles. While numerous short streams run down the mountain gorges to the coast, there is one river of considerable length which, rising in the south of the peninsula, flows slowly northwards through its centre until, when more than half-way north, it turns suddenly east and falls into the Gulf of Kamtchatka. In its bend it encloses a group of volcanic mountains, active and extinct, which for grace and grandeur can nowhere be matched. The valley, through which the river flows, partly marshy, partly tundra, partly forest-clad, might, under proper conditions of culture and with a little more of sunshine, be considerably developed. The people, numbering only a few thousands, are largely mixed with Russian settlers, and these half-breeds are as a rule a mean-spirited and grasping race; the few genuine aborigines that still exist are as gentle and as genial, hospitable and generous, as their somewhat remote kinsmen the Koriaks and the Chukchees. The conquest of Kamtchatka forms a bloody page in the annals of the Russian advance in Siberia. It took many fierce fights to subdue the Kamtchadales, as it did to subdue the Chukchees, though now neither the one nor the other look as if they could lift a hand against any one. Dr. Guillemard's notes of his experiences among the natives, and indeed of all he saw and heard in this remarkable peninsula, are a valuable contribution to geographical and scientific knowledge. He and his companions did what probably no European, or for that matter, no native, has ever done before.

The 'Marchesa' came to anchor in Avatcha Bay, which competes with the bays of San Francisco, Rio de Janeiro, and Sydney, as the finest harbour in the world. Here we find the well-known but now unimportant port of Petropaulovski, where, during the Crimean war, an incident happened, about which little was heard at the time, and which throws little credit on the British Navy. Dr. Guillemard tells us all about it, and any one desirous of being informed on the subject cannot do better than read his statement.

statement. With some difficulty arrangements were made for a visit to the interior and a journey down the river. This involved not a few trials, arising mainly from the extortionate demands of the natives on the river banks. But happily the task was accomplished, and the results, as described by Dr. Guillemard, were well worth all they cost. Indeed, on the whole, we are inclined to rank the Kamtchatkan experiences as of more original value and interest than any of the other work done during the cruise. It is impossible for us to follow the party on their excursion down this little-known river. Probably the most important industry of the peninsula is sable-hunting; and Dr. Guillemard tells us much about the value of this industry, the sable itself, and the lives and methods of its hunters. Other animals are of course hunted for their skins, and altogether the few persons that have the monopoly of the trade find it successful. In working out the natural history of the peninsula, Dr. Guillemard was greatly assisted by the well-known naturalist, Dr. Dybowski, practically an exile here, and with nearly all Kamtchatka as his field of practice. Dr. Guillemard can hardly find terms glowing enough in which to speak of the superb scenery formed by the volcanic groups of the peninsula. In speaking of these exquisitely beautiful snow-covered volcanoes, he writes:—

‘It is only with an effort that one withdraws his gaze from the exquisite beauty of mountains such as these. What is it that influences us so deeply in the sight of these eternal snows? In what lies that wonderful charm that we experience only in the region of the North? After many years of travel I think that there is one scene which has, perhaps, remained more vividly stamped upon my memory than any other—a placid river in Northern Lapland, down whose stream I floated, drinking in the perfect beauties of the changing autumn. Amid all the mass of scarlet and gold that hung above the mirror-like surface of the water, not a leaf was stirring, not a sound was to be heard. Before us lay the peaks of dazzling snow, and it seemed as though all nature were hushed and worshipping at that throne of spotless purity. Rest and purity then—the unattainable, in other words—in these lie the charm. The fairest tropic scene holds no deeper meanings such as these. Beauty of form there doubtless is, a far greater beauty perhaps than that of Northern climes, but after all it is but soulless. The teeming life of a tropical forest, the marvellous wealth of vegetation, the reckless sacrifice of the weakest, produce upon the mind the same effect as do the streets of a crowded city. No grandeur of “calm decay,” no pathos of the changing seasons is here. It is a fierce struggle for existence, fatal to any except the most purely matured thought.’

This eloquent and pathetic passage cannot but suggest to those



those who have read the 'Life of Darwin' the impressions made upon that great naturalist when first he found himself in a tropical forest. Nothing in the way of scenery ever impressed him more, and he accounts for it somewhat by the fact, that it was suggestive of the supernatural. After he lost his belief in the supernatural, Darwin admitted that a tropical forest had lost most of its charms. Is it not, then, this element that to some extent inspires the unequalled impressions of the silent and snow-clad scenes referred to by Dr. Guillemard; impressions which must be familiar to every one who has been high up in the Himalayas, or even alone in the Caucasus or the Alps? He feels as a man might feel who was upon an uninhabited world—alone with the Maker of all these wonderful works. But that scenes of purity and beauty in Kamtchatka, Lapland, Brazil, or elsewhere, have no permanent moral effect, is only too well proved in the history of the world.

Had space permitted, there is much in the Kamtchatkan portion of the book deserving special reference. The remarkable likeness of the avifauna of the peninsula to that of England struck Dr. Guillemard. But perhaps one of the things that will astonish the reader most is the enormous number of salmon that frequent the Kamtchatkan river. In this respect the Asiatic side of Behring Sea resembles the American; a similar wasteful profusion of salmon is witnessed in the Alaskan rivers. We say 'wasteful,' because hundreds of thousands of these fish die and rot on the banks of the river, which, large as it is, seems to be too small to hold the shoals that swarm up its stream. The wonderful variety of species and even of form of salmon, which frequent Kamtchatka river, also strike the Englishman, accustomed only to the very few varieties that are to be found in the waters of his native land. The change from birch, which prevailed in the upper river, though long grass, to spruce and fir, is an interesting fact, in connection with the physical geography of Kamtchatka. Of the scenery of the river, in its upper reaches, Dr. Guillemard gives us a beautiful picture:—

'The river ran between pebbly banks lined with birches, whose white-barked stems contrasted with the brilliant gold of their foliage. Reach after reach of still water opened out to us its quiet beauty, and here and there a little gap revealed a Hobbema-like scene of sunny distance, whose clearness was unbroken by the waver of a single leaf. Far away in front rose a range of deep blue hills, jagged and peaky, patched only with snow, for the southern slopes had been thawed by the heat of the summer sun. The calm surface of the water was covered by little packs of ducks, which rose in long lines

as our rafts approached, and the smoke of our guns formed miniature clouds in the water which hung motionless above the stream until the rounding of a corner hid them from our view. We paddled on silently, the natives talking but little. Now and again the warning *na pravo, na levo* (to the right, to the left), told of the neighbourhood of a snag, or a shallow bank necessitated the use of poles; but for the most part our progress was one of uninterrupted quiet, and the laziest of nature's lovers could have asked for nothing better than to sit and be paddled thus for the rest of his natural life.

As a contrast, let us quote the following scene, much farther down the river :—

'We floated silently down stream for a couple of hours or more, thinking over the discussion, that, we knew only too well, would be renewed at the earliest opportunity, when, turning a sudden corner, we found ourselves face to face with a view that banished all thoughts of past and future annoyances in a moment. Before us, eighty miles or more away, stood one of the grandest groups of volcanoes in the known world. Others there are, it is true, that are higher, although the elevated ground from which they take their rise detracts in no little degree from their apparent height. But here, from a base elevated scarce a hundred feet above the sea, a series of cones of the most exquisitely symmetrical shape rose in heights varying from 12,000 to 17,000 feet. They were three in number. Nearest us was Tolbatchinska, dog-toothed in shape, with its apex on the western side, a long thin puff of white smoke drifting from its shoulder; and beyond, apparently in close proximity to one another, rose the twin peaks of Kojerevska and Kluchefskaya, perfect in their outline,—pyramids of the purest snow, before which one felt how poor was all language to express the sense of their perfect beauty. Snow mountains were no novelty to us. We had seen the Andes and the Alps, and had watched the sun rise on Cotopaxi, on Etna, on Fuziyama, and a dozen other mountains of equal note. But here all question of comparison would have been a sacrilege, and floating over the unruffled surface of the river we sat spellbound, drinking in the view. The sun sank slowly as we crept along, and slope and peak, at first a dazzling white, turned slowly to a glowing gold. On either hand the fast-approaching night had changed the glories of the autumn tints to a sombre shade of violet, and behind us the river was a mere streak of light. The bright glow of the fire upon the other raft lit up the bearded faces of our Russian guides around it, and when the daylight had fairly waned, the head of Kluchefskaya stood out a pale greenish white,—a spectral mountain against the fast darkening sky. Come what might, even if we were never again to get a glimpse of them, we had seen the great volcanoes, and we felt that the sight was one that we could not easily forget for many years to come.'

Surely such rare delights as these, combined with the fact, that

that good Big-horn shooting is to be obtained amongst the coast hills, ought to prove an irresistible attraction to such sportsmen as combine a love of the chase with a taste for exquisite scenery. We are loath to leave this section of Dr. Guillemard's narrative, full of novelty as it is, and suggestive of so many interesting problems, not the least interesting that of the presence of a colony of Lamuts among the mountains of the peninsula. A visit to Behring Island leads Dr. Guillemard to give a useful sketch of the history of Kamtchatka, and details of Behring's various journeys, concluding with his sad and pathetic death on the shore of the little island now named after him.

From the grandeur of Kamtchatka, and the inhospitable islands of the Behring Sea, we are transported away far southwards to the tropical paradise of islands that lie between  $10^{\circ}$  N. and  $10^{\circ}$  S. of the equator. We fear that the soft and witching beauties of Sulu made Dr. Guillemard almost forget the fascination of Kamtchatka; at least the language he uses in writing of the one is scarcely surpassed in strength and eloquence by that he uses of the other. Cagayan Sulu was reached in March 1883. This tiny island, a typical example of the tropical island, lies a short distance from the north coast of Borneo, with which it seems more nearly connected than with the little Sulu archipelago further to the eastwards. Like most of the Malay islands, it shows a number of traces of volcanic action, and one of its great attractions to the naturalist and the lover of beautiful scenes is the three curious crater lakes just within the edge of its southern coast. Dr. Guillemard writes in the most enthusiastic terms of the beauties of the island. In the Sulu archipelago proper the 'Marchesa' stayed some time, the principal island being thoroughly explored. These islands are now under the dominion of the Spaniards, who are hated by the natives; the English visitor, on the other hand, being treated with the greatest courtesy and kindness. The natives are pleasant, and attractive enough in some respects, but, like their young sultan, their chief occupation seems to be sensuality. The Spaniards are almost entirely confined to their fortified port at Jolo, the interior of which has been made as Spanish as possible, even to the introduction of brutal bull-fights. The native chiefs seem to be constantly at war with each other. The population is exceedingly nondescript, the Malay element of course prevailing. In the centre of the island, a German, Captain Schück, has been established as a planter for many years, and lives undisturbed by the combative natives. Biologically the Sulu Islands are of special interest.

interest. In position they are as near to Borneo as to the Philippines, but Mr. Burbidge found that the plants, as Dr. Guillemard found that the animals, are almost purely Philippine. The physical geography as well as the biology, of the Philippines and Borneo, are very sharply contrasted. The former are almost entirely Austro-Malay, and essentially insular, while Borneo gives evidence of having quite recently been joined to the continent, and its fauna is distinctly Indo-Malayan. There is scarcely any trace of volcanic action in Borneo; and Mr. Wallace, we believe, maintains that the island must in quite recent geological times have been submerged. This may account for its comparatively 'unformed' condition, and the saturated state of much of the land, a feature not auguring very favourably for the attempt to colonize the north of the island. The 'Marchesa' visited Sundakan, the chief town and harbour of British North Borneo; and Dr. Guillemard criticizes very freely the economic and administrative condition of the colony. Although, according to the official statistics of the Company, it has been as yet nearly all outlay with but little revenue, improvement is noticeable. Let us hope that this improvement will continue, for the position has some strategical value, so far as British interests in these regions are concerned.

Space will not permit of our following the 'Marchesa,' as she lazily cruised among the many islands that lie between Borneo and New Guinea. Nor is it necessary, for we hope that what we have written will afford some idea of the attractions and the very varied interest of Dr. Guillemard's narrative. Visits to Batavia, Sumbawa, and Celebes, afforded him an opportunity of seeing something of Dutch life and Dutch policy in the Eastern archipelago, and Dr. Guillemard entirely endorses Mr. Wallace's admiration of the sensible Dutch method of dealing with the natives.

"Wherever we went," he writes, "in Minahassa, we found a contented, happy people, amongst whom drunkenness and crime were almost non-existent. The land was highly cultivated, the villages neater and cleaner than I have seen them in any part of the civilized world. Schools were established in every district, and the natives were almost without exception Christian. Where can we, who call ourselves the greatest colonizing nation in the world, point to a like result? What is the condition of the natives in "our colonies," in Australia, in New Zealand, in Western Africa? Year by year hundreds of Englishmen travel round the world, just as the former generation made the "grand tour." But they follow one another like sheep in the beaten track, and hardly any turn aside into the by-paths. It is, of course, almost an absurdity to suppose that an Englishman could have anything to learn from the management

ment of another nation's colonies, but those who have not the idea too deeply rooted may visit Northern Celebes with advantage."

The whole secret is that the Dutch wisely treat their natives like undeveloped children as they are, while we weakly treat our natives like full-grown citizens, having equal capacity and equal rights with the white man. At the same time, we are bound to point out, that the Dutch are beginning to discover that their system has its weaknesses, and that it will require serious modifications to adapt it to the changing conditions of the natives, to the progress they have made under the Dutch regime.

Another thing that struck Dr. Guillemard was the marked difference between the biological features of Sumbawa and those of Java, though the two islands are so near; the former are much more of an Australian than a Malay type. A considerable time was spent at Celebes; the coast was visited at several points, and an excursion was made to Tondano Lake in the interior. Celebes, from its peculiar fauna, unlike in many respects that of the neighbouring islands, probably dates, Mr. Wallace believes, from a period not only anterior to that when Borneo, Java, and Sumatra, were separated from the continent, but from that still more remote epoch when the land that now constitutes these islands had not risen above the ocean. With such a peculiar past, then, we can fancy with what interest a naturalist like Dr. Guillemard would study the fauna of the island. From Celebes to the Moluccas—Gilolo, Batchian, and their neighbours—thence to north-west New Guinea, south-west to Ceram and the Aru islands, and then homewards by Sulu and Singapore; and so probably the most remarkable yachting cruise on record was brought to a close. In New Guinea Dr. Guillemard naturally revelled among the great variety of Birds of Paradise, his collection of which must be superb, to judge from the beautiful illustrations he gives. Notwithstanding what we knew from previous writers, he is able to add much to our knowledge, not only of the natural history of this part of New Guinea, but also of the characteristics of its natives and their folk-lore. He speaks in a decidedly despondent way of the efforts of the many Dutch missionaries who have found a grave in this unhealthy region. The results at Dorei, for example, of twenty-eight years' work, and the sacrifice of many lives, are only sixteen adults and twenty-six child converts; and on the mass of the natives the influence has been absolutely nil. Dr. Guillemard was naturally surprised when, on referring to the Krakatau eruption, the missionary there told him that they heard the report distinctly, like cannonading. He showed

an entry in his diary of August 27, plainly recording the fact, though Dorei is 1710 miles from Krakatau.

On the curious and interesting island of Aru but a short stay was made, partly because it was found that it was the wrong season to find the great Bird of Paradise in plumage. The island is extremely unhealthy, and Dr. Guillemard was surprised to find that a Dutch official had recently been appointed, who was suffering greatly from the climate, and who had, as his first undertaking, begun to build a prison.

The collections brought home by Dr. Guillemard, especially of birds (including three living Birds of Paradise), but also including shells and insects, are so numerous that the mere titles fill many pages. They are as varied as they are numerous, and include not a few specimens that are new to science. In every sense, therefore, the cruise was of the most successful kind, not the least satisfactory result being the delightful narrative now before us. We have rarely seen a book of this class so abundantly and beautifully and appropriately illustrated, while the numerous good maps are a great comfort. Surely it shows how a little knowledge of, and interest in, some branch of natural science adds immensely to the enjoyment of a voyage or a journey, even if it be only a tour, and how much can be done to advance science by properly trained amateurs. Any one reading Dr. Guillemard's book with care is sure to want to know more concerning one of the most remarkable regions on our globe.

---

ART. VIII.—*Lord Carteret : a Political Biography, 1690–1763.*  
By Archibald Ballantyne. London, 1887.

WE have prefixed to this article the surname of the statesman who is the subject of it, rather than the title of Lord Granville, to which he succeeded in his later years, partly because Mr. Ballantyne has set us the example, partly because, while there is only one Carteret, there are several Granvilles, and partly because it is the name by which he is best known.

Mr. Ballantyne has not overestimated the merits of Lord Carteret, or his claim to a place in our political biography alongside of the leading statesmen of the eighteenth century. His own, however, is the first attempt that has been made to place a full-length portrait of him before the eyes of posterity ; and it is certainly surprising, that one who was so great a friend to literature in his own lifetime, and who played a part in our Constitutional history, the importance of which was so well understood by his contemporaries, should have found no *vates sacer* to record his actions till he had been dead nearly a century and a quarter. It is too much, perhaps, to say that ‘almost complete oblivion covers the career of Lord Carteret,’ or that the only portraits of him which have been handed down to us are ‘utterly fantastic and impossible.’ The spirited sketch of him to be found in Macaulay’s essay on Horace Walpole is almost sufficient to refute both of these assertions : for it is not only the many brilliant qualities, for which Carteret was distinguished, and the extent and variety of his attainments, to which the essayist does full justice ; he recognizes, at the same time, the force of character and the powers of mind, which entitle him to the name of a great statesman. He attributes his failure to his bad luck, and his contempt of all the arts without which in those days no minister could hope to maintain himself in power for more than a very limited period. Pitt, who was equally above them, was driven from office in five months when he ventured to defy them ; and it was not till he consented to coalesce with the Duke of Newcastle, and avail himself of the Duke’s intimate familiarity with the system which Walpole had matured, that he was able to hold his ground. But Macaulay evidently regards Carteret as one of the finest intellects of his time. And though we cannot quite say of our modern historian what Thackeray has said of Gibbon, that to be mentioned in his pages is ‘like having one’s name written on the dome of St. Peter’s,’ yet it is certainly enough to save any man from ‘complete oblivion.’

Yet it may be fairly said that, to what are really the most  
N 2 important



important and instructive passages in Carteret's career, the words applied by Mr. Ballantyne to the whole of it are perfectly appropriate; that they are indeed 'almost buried in complete oblivion.' Carteret's eccentricities and vivacity, his love of literature, his love of Greek, his love of Burgundy, his alleged levities at the Council Table, are what all know about him who know anything at all, and of these little need be said in this place. It has been related that, when about to be married, in 1743, to his second wife, a very handsome girl nearly thirty years younger than himself, he used to read her love letters to the Cabinet. He was not at that time a disappointed man, but, on the contrary, in the hey-day of his powers and deep in his political schemes, so that we cannot explain away this particular breach of ministerial dignity on the ground that he had then subsided into a political Democritus, with nothing to do but to laugh and drink till Death should demand his seals from him. Lord Macaulay, however, is inclined to suspect that many of these stories are gross exaggerations; and even if they are true, all we can say is that the follies of the wise are no new thing; and that much greater follies than these would be insufficient to weigh down the unanimous testimony of his contemporaries to the great parts, rare knowledge, and sterling scholarship of the Minister, who, according to Lord Chesterfield, was, at his death, 'the ablest head in England.'

If then Mr. Ballantyne does colour rather too highly the misrepresentation of which Carteret has been the victim, he is right enough in his main contention, namely, that the favourite Minister of George II. has never yet assumed his proper place in the literature of politics. The ill-natured notices of him to be found in Walpole's 'Letters and Memoirs,' in the works of Archdeacon Coxe, and in other books written by partisans of the great Whig Houses, are not likely to impose on any one whose opinion is of the least value; and we cannot think, therefore, that his modern admirers need distress themselves very much about the depreciation of his character, which has come down to us through these channels. The testimony on the other side is too weighty to be affected by it. But what we think does deserve to be lifted out of the obscurity in which it has so long lain is, first of all, the part which he played in the Ministry of 1742, and the ministerial crisis of 1746, and secondly, the character of his foreign policy, to which, before the appearance of Mr. Carlyle's 'Frederick the Great,' no kind of justice had been done, and of which, even from his pages, we gather no complete view.

It

It is for the sake of these two questions that Lord Carteret's career is worth studying. His personal character is very interesting. But that alone would hardly be a sufficient reason for noticing him at any length in these pages. But the two points we have mentioned involve considerations of the highest importance; and to one of them attention has been called by a great English statesman whom Mr. Ballantyne does not seem to have consulted. We mean Lord Beaconsfield, the only modern English writer who seems to have caught the full meaning and significance of what was passing in that memorable month of February, when with one-half of the kingdom in rebellion, the Ministers of the Crown in a body flung their appointments at their sovereign's head, and in the face of a pressing public danger left the King and the country without a Government.

Before entering, however, on these very interesting and suggestive topics, we propose to give, with the help of Mr. Ballantyne, a brief outline of Lord Carteret's family history and earlier career, so that our readers may know with what manner of man they are dealing when they come to the meridian of his course. John Lord Carteret was of Norman descent on both sides; his mother, Grace Granville, being the granddaughter of the Sir Bevil Granville who was killed at the Battle of Lansdowne. His father's family, the lords of Carteret in Normandy, sent some of their cadets with William the Conqueror into England, whose descendants settled eventually in the Channel Islands, which they held against the French for centuries. They were usually Governors of Jersey, and Queen Elizabeth gave them the Island of Sark. During the civil war the head of the family was Sir George Carteret, who kept Jersey for the King, and was the last man in the realm to lay down his arms. On the execution of Charles I., he at once proclaimed Charles II., whom he sheltered for two months in 1646, and again in 1649 in Elizabeth Castle. Here, too, Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, stayed for nearly two years, and wrote a portion of his history. The castle, however, was eventually stormed by Cromwell in 1651, and Carteret joined the King in Holland.

He rode into London with Charles on the 30th of May 1660; but the peerage intended for him was for some reason delayed, and the first Lord Carteret was his grandson, eldest son of Sir Philip Carteret, who was killed at the battle of Southwold in 1672. The young Lord married, as we have seen, Grace Granville; and their son, the future statesman, was born on the 22nd of April, 1690. His father died in 1695, so that he  
became

became Lord Carteret at five years old. His mother was created Countess Granville in her own right in 1715, and survived till 1743. John was sent to Westminster, then, and for many years afterwards, one of the great nurseries of English statesmen: Newcastle, Hervey, Murray, and Pulteney, being among his contemporaries. From Westminster, he proceeded in due course to Christchurch, and brought away with him from Oxford more knowledge of Greek and Latin than was supposed in those days to become the character of a gentleman. On the 19th of October, 1710, when he was not yet one-and-twenty, he married Lady Frances Worsely, daughter of the first Lord Weymouth, who was not yet seventeen, and in the May following he took his seat in the House of Lords.

Macaulay says of Carteret that he was at once the unluckiest and the happiest of public men. Of his luck we shall have something to say hereafter. Of the best kind of happiness he certainly had a large share. His wife was one of the most beautiful women of the age; and when she had grown-up daughters, more beautiful than any one but herself, she still retained her charms. She was devotedly attached to her husband, and not a breath of slander ever rested on her name. Carteret 'loved his fireside.' Home was delightful to him. In public life he made himself a great name, and had either the first or the second place in politics for nearly sixteen years. His intimate friends were the leading scholars and men of letters of the day. Swift, Bentley, Pope, Gay, Addison, were among the number; and his reputation for literary conversation was quite equal to his reputation for eloquence. His Greek scholarship is well known, and we may depend upon it that Bentley never thought of his hat when his companion was Carteret. Nor did his accomplishments end here. Mr. Ballantyne quotes a letter from Gay to Swift, dated from Amesbury, in Wiltshire, in which he tells him that Carteret had just left three brace of pheasants with them, on his return from pheasant-shooting in the Isle of Wight. What more could a man want? A beautiful and devoted wife, a fine family, a brilliant political position, a rare capacity for the enjoyment of both ancient and modern literature, and the society of its chief ornaments, a boon companion and a sportsman, he seems to have united in himself all the elements of happiness and pleasure which human life has to give. He had indeed a plentiful share of pecuniary embarrassments, but they never troubled him. He once owed 2000*l.* to his coal merchant, who put an execution in his house. Carteret shortly afterwards saw the man in the hall, and greeted him with

with so much urbanity that he served him to the day of his death. His wife, his gun, his classics, and his cellar, consoled him under all misfortunes. In his last great *coup*, when all was lost, he 'went away laughing.'

Carteret was one of the handsomest men of his time, with a fine figure, courtly manners, and a natural gift of eloquence set off by an admirable voice. With his wit, his culture, and his courage, when he entered public life he must have seemed to have the ball at his feet, and to have had only to hold out his hand to grasp the highest offices in the State. When he first entered Parliament, however, he did not, as it might have been expected that he would, take his place among the Tories. A Tory Government was in power. Swift and Bolingbroke were, at this time, among his intimate friends. The politics of his family were Cavalier to the backbone. Chesterfield tells us that he had been bred up in high monarchical notions, and accounts for some passages in his after life by this very circumstance. He never gave in to the special claims advanced by the Revolution families. What determined him then to throw in his lot with the Whigs? To understand his position thoroughly, we must look a little more closely to the conditions of political parties in 1711.

The Tory Party was at this time divided into three main branches, the Hanoverians, the Jacobites, and the Neutrals. Of the first of these, the distinguishing sentiment was a devoted attachment to the Church of England as by law established, and a dislike of any political movement which tended to unsettle her position. In the eyes of these men, the secession of the Stuarts to Rome was an insuperable bar to their restoration. They do not seem to have placed much reliance on any promises, pledges, or guarantees, which James III. might be induced to give. They judged, and perhaps rightly, that with a Roman Catholic on the throne the Church of England could never be secure. They were Churchmen first and legitimists afterwards. One fact alone affords ample proof of this assertion. They bought off the opposition of the Whigs to the Occasional Conformity Bill, by consenting to vote against the Government on the Treaty of Peace with France. When they saw their way to advancing their ecclesiastical principles at the expense of their political allegiance, they did not hesitate for a moment. The head of this party was Lord Nottingham.

Of the Jacobites little need be said. They believed that the sanctity of hereditary right must be preserved inviolate at any cost of the Stewart interest in England. The Neutrals were those

those Tories who were pledged, neither to divine right on the one hand, nor to the Protestant succession on the other. They were for the old method of Government; for the king, who would give the greatest support to the old Cavalier Party, to the country gentlemen, the clergy, and the landed interest in general. What they wanted was, not so much either a legitimate king, or a Parliamentary king, as a Tory king. These men disliked the new moneyed interest which had been created by the Revolution; they saw no necessity for expensive Continental wars, and they clung to the idea of a real monarchy, tempered, but not superseded, by a proper combination of aristocratic and popular institutions. The chief of this party was the ablest man of the time, Lord Bolingbroke.

It is not difficult to understand why Carteret could not act with any one of these parties. He agreed with the Hanoverian Tories in their zeal for the Protestant succession, and therefore he could not be a Jacobite. But he had evidently imbibed something of the latitudinarian spirit of the age, and therefore he could not act with Lord Nottingham. He said long afterwards that he would never join in attacking any minister who was 'ecclesiastically insulted.' The cry of 'High Church and Sacheverel' would not be at all to his taste. On the other hand, though in all matters connected with Church and State he was probably at one with Bolingbroke, he differed from him fundamentally on the system of foreign policy which it was expedient for England to pursue; and he could not therefore concur with the Government in their conduct of the French war. Carteret was a very young man, to have formed decided opinions of his own on any one of these important subjects. Yet unless he had, he would have followed the politics of his family, and have joined the Tories at once. Of course, if he believed that Bolingbroke was at heart a Jacobite, his reasons for not joining him would be clear enough. And the fact, that he voted with the minority in 1714 on the motion that the Protestant succession was in danger, affords some presumption that he really did think so. But throughout his career he was against the French Alliance, and it seems to have been this question, after all, which separated him from Bolingbroke after they had been acting together more than ten years.

But though Carteret joined the Whig party, and ever afterwards continued nominally to belong to it, he was not essentially a Whig. This Party also was divided into three sections, the oligarchical Whigs, the liberal Whigs, and the religious Whigs. The first consisted of the so-called 'Revolution

tion families,' and all their adherents and dependants whose fortunes were staked on the maintenance of the new system, of which the oligarchy was supposed to be the mainstay. With the majority of these men civil and religious liberty was only a means to an end, as was sufficiently shown by Sir Robert Walpole's behaviour to the Dissenters; which was very much the same as Sir Robert Peel's treatment of the Protectionists. Their object was to regain for the English nobility the power which it had been too feeble to retain after the Wars of the Roses, and which under the Tudors and the Stuarts had been gradually absorbed by the Crown. To this motive may be added the fear of losing their estates, should a Roman Catholic sovereign re-establish the Roman Catholic Church and compel them to disgorge the Abbey lands. It is obvious, however, that the Monarchy of the Plantagenets, which was the offspring of the feudal system, could not be revived in the eighteenth century, when the feudal system had expired. The attempt only ended in depressing the power of the Crown to a very much lower level than it had stood at under the Henrys and the Edwards, and in making a few great families virtually masters of the State.

The liberal Whigs, who represented perhaps rather a mode of thought than an actual party, and might perhaps be called more truly the middle-class Whigs, were men nurtured in the doctrines of Locke; who sincerely believed in civil and religious liberty; who had no personal end to serve by promoting one form of government rather than another; but who were convinced that the supremacy of the Whig Party was our only security against Popery and absolute monarchy. Such men had no sympathy with the oligarchy, but supported them as a necessary evil. They were always much moved by such epithets as slavish, servile, and superstitious, attached to the tenets of the Tories; while a portion of their Party had also, like the 'Houses,' a material interest in the Revolution, being actuated by that jealousy between the trading and territorial interests, which was then beginning to spring up, and is good-humouredly typified in 'Sir Andrew Freeport' and 'Sir Roger de Coverley.' It is quite clear that men of this party, whether their Whiggism was of the closet or the counter, could have cared little in the abstract for the domination of the Pelhams, the Seymours, and the Russells. And in process of time indeed, as all danger of a Stuart restoration wore away, many of them became Tories, and before the end of the century were one of the great elements of strength in the Tory Party.

Of the Dissenters and religious Whigs no description is required.

required. They had no antipathy to prerogative, when it was exerted in their own favour, and no particular regard for official Whiggism, when it was opposed to them. But in the early part of the century they still expected great things from the victorious party, and were one of its most powerful allies.

Now it is just as impossible to identify Carteret with any one of these three parties, as with any one of the three Tory parties. He was not a High Church Tory, he was not an Anti-German Tory, and he was not a Jacobite. His subsequent career will show that he was not an oligarchic Whig; it is idle to speak of him as a religious Whig; and if we dub him a liberal Whig, it must be with considerable reservation. But this much we may assume, that, having to choose between the two parties on his entrance into public life, he chose the one which seemed to him, upon the whole, best calculated to promote the public interest. The bad side of Whiggism had not yet developed itself. The Families had not yet riveted their yoke upon the Crown. Their foreign policy seemed, so far, to be dictated by public considerations. They were the enemies of the ecclesiastical system which, with a young man's natural propensity to oppose himself to the opinions of his family, he had learned to dislike. The system of Parliamentary corruption had not yet been introduced; and Carteret, therefore, without becoming a genuine Whig, may readily have made up his mind that he could act usefully and honourably with that party; and though he wandered very far from Whig orthodoxy at one period of his life, and died a member of a Tory government, he never ceased to call himself a Whig from the day he took his seat in the House of Lords to the day when he breathed his last with the praises of a Tory Treaty on his lips.

With the autumn of 1714 came the death of Anne, the accession of George I., and the Whig Ministry, in which Townsend, Stanhope, and Walpole, were the leading spirits. So valuable a recruit as Carteret was not left long unemployed. In 1716, when only twenty-six years of age, he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Devonshire, and exerted himself actively on behalf of the new government. In 1717 he spoke very ably in support of the Septennial Bill, dwelling particularly on the bad effect produced on the minds of continental statesmen by the frequent changes of policy to which the English Government was liable; and it is interesting to find the same complaint, with which we are so familiar in our own day, anticipated by the rising young statesman of the reign of George I.

In 1718 occurred the first attempt, on the part of the European Powers,



Powers, to modify the Treaty of Utrecht; and the history of English foreign policy, from that date to 1734, is the history of all the complicated transactions to which repeated efforts of the same kind gave rise. War broke out between Spain and Austria in the first mentioned year, when our engagements with Austria, from whom George I., as Elector of Hanover, had something to expect, compelled us to take part against Spain. The Spanish fleet intended to aid in the conquest of Sicily was destroyed by Admiral Byng off Cape Passaro on the 10th of August; and, when Parliament assembled in November, Carteret was selected to move the Address in the House of Lords, congratulating His Majesty on the event. But, in order to prevent the Sicilian expedition, England had gone so far as to offer Spain the restitution of Gibraltar; while her support of Austria was the price by which the King hoped to gain his cherished object, the investiture of the two Duchies of Bremen and Verden. These are the pivots on which our foreign policy turned for sixteen years: the investiture of the Duchies and the restoration of the fortress. To extort the one and to evade the other became the two great objects of every English statesman, who wished to stand well with the new dynasty. The Emperor Charles VI., on his part, was anxious to obtain from England in return the guarantee of the 'Pragmatic Sanction,' or an instrument securing to his daughter Maria Theresa the succession to his hereditary dominions, which was finally conceded to him in 1731. During the greater part of this period, however, Carteret was away from England. In 1719 he went as ambassador to Sweden, where his combined courage and sagacity obtained a great diplomatic triumph. In 1724 he was appointed to succeed the Duke of Grafton as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, an office which he held for six years. But from 1721 to 1724, he was Secretary of State for the Southern Department, with Lord Townsend—not the Duke of Newcastle, as Mr. Ballantyne erroneously asserts—for his colleague in the Northern. And it was during this period that those secret negotiations with Spain on the subject of Gibraltar took place, which Earl Stanhope tells us in his History cannot be accurately traced. The Carteret Papers, however, seem to make them tolerably clear, and to show that Carteret, in the pursuit of great public objects, did not stick at trifles any more than Bolingbroke or Warren Hastings.

Lord Stanhope, the English Minister, had stated to the Spanish Government, as early as 1717, that he himself saw no objection to the restitution of Gibraltar; and George I., somewhere about that time, wrote a letter to the king of Spain, professing his willingness to restore Gibraltar 'for a consideration,'

consideration,' the equivalent being in this case the abandonment by Spain of the Sicilian expedition, which plunged England into war, and led directly to the battle of Passaro. As Spain did not fulfil the required condition, the letter of course fell to the ground. So far, she had nothing to complain of. But a second letter, written by the king of England in June 1721, three months after Carteret had become Foreign Secretary, is not so easily got rid of. In this letter George, at the repeated solicitation of Spain, promised the restoration of the fortress unconditionally, without any equivalent being required, subject only to the consent of the English Parliament. It was on this understanding that Spain consented to the Peace. And we confess we have never been able to understand on what ground the king could refuse proposing it to Parliament, even though he knew it would be useless. We have referred to the Carteret MSS. in the British Museum, in hope of finding something in them to palliate Carteret's share in this transaction. But we can find nothing. The proposal was made by the Spanish minister to William Stanhope, afterwards Lord Harrington, the English ambassador at Madrid, who referred the matter to Carteret, and it was clearly with his approval that this second letter was written. Carteret only stipulates with Stanhope that he shall get back the first letter, for fear it should come to the knowledge of Parliament that larger concessions had been made by himself than by his predecessor: and we wish we could see our way to treating it as lightly as Mr. Ballantyne does.

'George, who himself was personally indifferent to the thing, did write such a conditional letter to the King of Spain, well knowing that it was a mere empty form. . . . When the court of Spain querulously insisted that the equivalent should be left out, George wrote again in June 1721, yielding to their patents verbatim. So long as this consent of Parliament was insisted on, what else might be mentioned was to England a matter of indifference. Carteret said that "Spain would not yield with a good grace, let her yield with a bad one, then, since her notions of deportment were of no practical significance."'

If Mr. Ballantyne thinks he is joking, there is of course no more to be said. If not, can he show us that Spain's accession to the peace was not obtained from her by false pretences? Spain did not know that the letter was a 'mere empty form.' In much later times, sovereigns, who have had much better opportunities than Philip V. of becoming acquainted with English institutions, have shown themselves incapable of understanding the working of Parliamentary Government. Is it likely that a  
King

King of Spain, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, would have been better informed upon the subject than the Emperors of Austria or Russia only sixty years ago; or have supposed for one moment that, when George I. made his promise dependent on the consent of Parliament, he had not only no means of procuring that consent, but never intended even to make any effort to procure it? The letter must have meant something in the eyes of the Spaniards, or why should they have accepted it at all? The king knew this, and yet all the time was conscious that it meant nothing. It cannot be said that it was written only to satisfy the *amour propre* of Spain, who never herself attached any serious significance to it; for the court of Spain continued, for ten years afterwards, to base her claim to Gibraltar on that very document. And finally why, if there was nothing to be ashamed of in it, did Walpole in 1727 deny its existence? \* That a second letter was written is clear from the Carteret correspondence, notwithstanding Walpole's speech; and the opposition got wind of it, in spite of all the care that was taken to conceal it. It was a fine subject for the 'Craftsman;' and those who are interested in such matters should glance at the articles which appeared in it at this date, and see how journalists like Bolingbroke and Pulteney handled their weapons.†

The hour, however, was now at hand when Walpole was to shake off Carteret, as he had shaken off Pulteney, and as he afterwards shook off Townsend, Argyle, and Chesterfield. Sir Robert took advantage of a quarrel between Carteret and Townsend, of much the same nature as the quarrel between Fox and Shelburne in 1782, to get rid of the abler of the two, and Carteret went into an honourable exile as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He retired from the Foreign Office in April, 1724, and on the 23rd of the following October, the anniversary of the great massacre, landed at Dublin just when the storm aroused by 'Wood's halfpence' was at its greatest height. Here is an instance of what Macaulay calls Carteret's ill-luck. With every mental and bodily endowment calculated to make him popular in Ireland, he arrived there at a moment when he was absolutely compelled to oppose himself to popular feeling, and the ground which he then lost he never seems to have regained. He too very nearly added one more to the number of wrecked reputations which lie buried under the Irish question. 'He,' as Mr. Froude says, 'the ablest man at Walpole's disposal,' ‡ con-

\* 'Parliamentary History,' vol. viii. pp. 532, 543.

† January 4th, 1729. See also two undated papers in the same volume.

‡ Froude's 'English in Ireland,' vol. i. p. 533.

spicuous for courage and resolution, and a match for all the statesmen of Europe, was baffled when he came to Ireland. He had been sent out to quell the ferment, and he was obliged to succumb to it.

Carteret, however, did his best; he determined to prosecute Drapier. When told by some members of the Irish Privy Council that they could not in that case answer for the public peace, Carteret replied with dignity, 'As long as I have the honour to be Chief Governor here, the peace of the kingdom shall be kept.' When publicly reproached by Swift, who was known to be the author of the Letters, though he had not declared himself, and nobody could prove it, with issuing a proclamation against a poor shopkeeper, he replied impromptu—

'Res dura et regni novitas me talia cogunt  
Moliri.'

Not indeed that the quotation seems to us particularly happy, for it was not Carteret's newness to office which imposed on him the necessity of taking steps to vindicate the law. It was, however, highly applauded at the time; and, at all events, it had the immediate effect of shutting Swift's mouth. But it was all in vain. In the following September the Patent was withdrawn, and the remainder of Carteret's time of office passed quietly away. He saw, as others saw, both before and after, that a system made up of alternate coaxing and coercion—a system founded partly on the belief that the Roman Catholics were good and loyal subjects, partly on the belief that they were incorrigible traitors, ruffians, and criminals—must necessarily break down. But circumstances made it difficult, if not impossible, for the English Government to follow any other course. The Hanoverian Dynasty depended on Protestant support, yet had engagements with the Catholic Powers on the Continent, which made half measures a necessity. George I., in fact, found himself in much the same dilemma as that which embarrassed Charles I. Carteret, like others, tried to steer a middle course, and pleased nobody. It is barely necessary to notice the absurd suspicion set afloat by the Duke of Newcastle and Lord Townsend, that Carteret himself had contributed to the commotion about Wood's halfpence. It is more worthy of record that, according to Mr. Ballantyne, he saw from the first how it must end, and recommended his colleagues, before he left England in August, to adopt the very course which they were obliged to take a year afterwards.

But when he once found himself in Ireland his English love of law and order recoiled from the spectacle which he witnessed, and

and his resolution was taken to uphold the principles of which he was the public representative.

Carteret returned from Ireland in 1730, to find Sir Robert Walpole at the very summit of his power. The attempt to displace him on the accession of George II. had signally failed, and left him stronger than before. Pulteney, it is true, was leading the Opposition in the House of Commons with extraordinary animosity and ability; and Bolingbroke was devoting his whole powers to the destruction of the common enemy. But Sir Robert had not yet parted either with the Duke of Argyle, or Lord Chesterfield, or Lord Stair, or Lord Cobham. The two Secretaries of State were the Duke of Newcastle and the Earl of Harrington; the latter, useless, indeed, in debate, but a diplomatist of the first rank; the former, the greatest boroughmonger of his age, and the representative in the Cabinet of the 'great Revolution Families,' as they were called,—the Devonshires, Richmonds, Graftons, Portlands, Rutlands, Somersets, Fitzwilliams, and many more of great wealth and influence,—who conceived themselves entitled, either officially or unofficially, to direct the whole policy of the country. Sir Robert was their man; and when Carteret formally assumed the leadership of the Opposition in the House of Lords, his position appeared to be impregnable.

Carteret would probably have been contented to work with Walpole, on the understanding, that his abilities and his knowledge should have fair play in the Cabinet. But his own genius would not allow him to be effaced, and if he could not do himself justice as a member of the Government, he must look out for some other situation. In this view of his position there was not the same kind of laxity, or indifference to principle, as there would be at the present day. All the Whigs alike were pledged to the Revolution settlement. But, outside this, every man was at liberty to take his own line; and hence arose the party of discontented Whigs or Patriots, who went into opposition not so much because they were hostile to the principles of the Government, as because they could not belong to it without being reduced to cyphers. Pulteney had long been their leader in the Commons. Carteret was now to take a similar position in the House of Lords.

For the first two sessions of Parliament after Carteret's return, there was little to do in the way of foreign affairs; and Carteret did not at once declare open war against the Government. But he lost no time \* in letting Parliament understand that his own

---

\* See Motion, deprecating war with Austria, January 21, 1731.

ideas of foreign policy had undergone no change since he resigned the seals in 1724. The key to that policy was the necessity of supporting Austria, on all occasions, as the counterpoise to France in Europe. Carteret's instincts told him that with the Bourbons, rather than the Hapsburgs, lay the chief danger to the peace of Europe. In his eyes, the family compact was already in existence. Blood was thicker than water; and the Bourbons, in the long run, were sure to stand shoulder to shoulder in any European quarrel. He seems to have thought no sacrifice too great which was calculated to avert this danger. England, at all events, had nothing to fear from the hostility of either Austria or Prussia, and much to expect from their friendship. To keep up a great Protestant and English interest in the centre of Germany was accordingly Carteret's first object. The King's Hanoverian proclivities only played into the hands of a statesman, who entertained such opinions as these. And we have always believed that he supported the King's policy, not only because it was the King's, but because it was also a truly English policy. He had not the experience of Lord Bolingbroke to prejudice him against the Austrians and the Dutch, who, as it turned out, were yet to behave as badly \* to us in the war of the Austrian Succession as they had done in the war of the Spanish.

We may track Carteret's course in Parliament by the Protests of the Lords. From March 7th, 1732, to November 18th, 1740, there are thirty-six protests, of which his name appears in twenty-nine, and then appears no more. These protests, with Mr. Rogers's notes upon them, and the Parliamentary History of the time, should now be carefully consulted, since it is here, if anywhere, that we shall find evidence of that tergiversation which was imputed to Carteret by his enemies—of his having abandoned in office the principles he had professed in Opposition, and of having betrayed the Party with whom he had fought against the Government, as soon as the victory was won and he found himself in possession of the prize. In other words, he was said to have made catspaws of the Tories, the Patriots, and the 'Boys' all round. The bitterest reproaches came from Bolingbroke, and are to be found in the 'Marchmont Papers.' But they are scarcely borne out by such facts as can still be ascertained.

We need hardly detain our readers over the domestic measures of this particular period, for with legislation of this nature Carteret was but little mixed up. He did, however,

\* See Stanhope's 'History of England,' vol. iv. p. 2, and Bolingbroke's 'State of the Nation,' 1749.

support the Bill introduced by Mr. Sandys in the House of Commons for excluding pensioners from Parliament, and this was one of the questions on which he was afterwards charged with having turned his coat. He opposed Sir Robert Walpole's appropriation of the Sinking Fund in 1733; and in Committee on the Mutiny Bill in March he supported the proposal to reduce the standing army from 18,000 to 12,000 men. But it is in his attitude on questions of foreign policy, and our transactions with the minor German States, that critics have seen the greatest discrepancy between the Carteret of 1732 and the Carteret of 1742. We may as well therefore proceed at once to the next occasion when the peace of Europe was broken, which was on the death of Augustus II., King of Poland, in February 1733, leading to war before the year was out between France and Austria. On the 29th of March, 1734, near the end of the Session—'felices proavorum atavi!'—the King sent down a message to the House of Commons asking for the means of making such an augmentation of his forces as the state of Europe seemed to require—the account to be laid before the next Parliament. That is to say, he asked for a blank cheque, to fill up as he pleased both with men and money. Carteret resisted this proposal, as he did again in 1739, not because he was opposed to the augmentation of the Army, but because he disapproved of lodging this unlimited discretion in the hands of the Ministry. The objection might be worthless, but we do not see how it could be thrown in his teeth afterwards when he was urging an increase to the Army in the ordinary manner, and in time of actual war. The dispute between the Continental Powers was settled by the Third Treaty of Vienna, signed in 1737; and Walpole took great credit to himself for having kept England out of the War. But it was not the Opposition that tried to drive him into it. If Walpole deserved credit, it was for resisting the King's wish to go to war when neither our interests nor our treaty obligations required it. Later on, they did.

'Walpole's peace policy had succeeded,' says Mr. Ballantyne. 'But it was for the last time. All events were steadily and irresistibly gravitating towards war between England and Spain, and useless war is never justifiable; England's war against Spain in 1739 was a just one.' This is one of the great questions of modern history, and on the answer to be given to it depends our estimate, to some extent, of the statesmanship of the Opposition leaders. Lord Macaulay, in his usual off-hand manner, decides it in the negative. Lord Stanhope follows on the same side: and Burke says that, conversing many



many years afterwards with some of the principal actors in this memorable controversy, he found those who had been most urgent for war ready to admit that they were wrong. He does not say, however, who they were, or what reasons they assigned for their tardy recantation. As far, indeed, as the special grievances alleged against the Spaniards are concerned, it may be that all three are in the right. But the real explanation and justification of the war lies in the fact, that the time had now come for deciding whether Spain or England was to be the greatest naval power in Europe. England practically had for many years been the stronger of the two; but Spain still adhered to pretensions which the more powerful State at length began to find intolerable. Under these circumstances the technical merits of the question mattered comparatively little. War between the two countries, for the settlement of this long-standing rivalry, was only a question of time. And in justice to Carteret, we may conclude that he thought so too. He saw that the right of search could no longer be conceded to a kingdom which had no longer the power of enforcing it, and though it is quite true that, at the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, the English demand was lost sight of, Carteret was not then in office, and in no way responsible for the omission.

Believing, therefore, that the Spanish war was unavoidable, we can find no fault with the statesmen who wished to see it vigorously prosecuted, or censured the Ministry for listening so long to the evasions and artifices, by which Spain tried to get the better of us in diplomacy before the sword was drawn.\* But if the Opposition *was* mistaken on this question, it was a mistake which they shared in common with the whole nation. Not so with the questions arising out of the French war, which came upon us four years afterwards.

War was declared against Spain on the 19th of October, 1739; and exactly one year afterwards, that is, on the 20th of October, 1740, died Charles VI., the Emperor of Germany, the same who as the Archduke Charles had been candidate for the throne of Spain in Queen Anne's reign. England, with other European Powers, had guaranteed the succession to his hereditary dominions to his daughter Maria Theresa, who was now twenty-three years of age, and married to the Duke of Lorraine † and Tuscany, who afterwards ‡ became Emperor with the title of Francis the First. Her right was disputed by the Elector of

\* Especially by the Convention of Párd, December 1738.

† He retained only the title. The Duchy had been surrendered to France in 1737.

‡ September 1745.

Bavaria, who was chosen Emperor as Charles VII. on the 24th of January, 1742; and the Continent was speedily divided into two camps, the one pledged to maintain the rights of the Queen of Hungary, the other to support the new Emperor. On the one side stood France, Spain, Poland, and Russia; on the other, England and Holland. Frederick the Great, who, immediately on the death of Charles VI., had pounced on Silesia, successfully resisted all the Queen's attempts to wrest it from him; but by the Treaty of Breslau, June 11, 1742, when Maria Theresa was persuaded to abandon it, peace was restored between them, and Frederick detached from France. This was Carteret's first diplomatic triumph after he became Minister.

It was in February 1742, that Walpole, after a long and obstinate struggle, in which he displayed throughout great courage, coolness, and presence of mind, finally struck his colours and made way for the victorious 'Patriots.' But many of his colleagues remained in office, and among them the Duke of Newcastle, who retained the seals of the Home Office and the Northern Department; and was the head of what was called the Pelham branch of the Cabinet. Carteret returned to the Southern Department, which would now be called the Foreign Office; and as Pulteney refused to be Prime Minister, contenting himself with a peerage and the privilege of forming the administration, Lord Wilmington, formerly Sir Spencer Compton, who had been Prime Minister for a day on the accession of George the Second, was promoted to that titular dignity—for it was no more. The head of the new government was Carteret.

We may now return to the year 1739, and observe Carteret's conduct under three different heads: the payment of subsidies to foreign states, the employment of foreign troops, and the purpose which he set before himself in making England a party to the war on a large scale, and virtually in the character of a principal instead of that of an auxiliary only, to which his colleagues desired to confine her. It must be borne in mind that the new war, from 1743 to 1748, is something wholly distinct from the old one, the war with Spain, which began in 1739, and had nothing to do with the continent of Europe at all; with either subsidies or mercenaries, or the fulfilment of treaty obligations.

It is said that, on the two first-mentioned questions, Carteret held different opinions before and after he became minister, and that having abused 'the Hanoverian system,' as it was called, to acquire popularity with the people, he supported it afterwards to acquire the favour of the Court. We have already given a partial answer to this indictment, nor are we

able to perceive by what facts it is supported. Lord Stanhope says of Carteret, on the proposed addition of 16,000 Hanoverians to the army in 1742, that, 'much as he had clamoured against such a system while in opposition, he now readily acceded to it,' &c. When had he clamoured against it? In 1730, a warm debate took place in the House of Lords on the retention of 12,000 Hessian troops in British pay. But Carteret did not speak, nor does his name appear in the Protest. Carteret's Irish appointment terminated in the very month in which the debate took place, and he could have been in his place had he cared about it. After this, from 1731 to 1742, no proposal had been made to take German troops into English pay; and, even if it had, would have worn a very different aspect in time of peace from what it did when the country was at war. This last distinction all Carteret's adverse critics seem entirely to overlook. He himself said in the debate on the Hanoverian troops just referred to that, supposing it to be true that England had at any time been made subservient to Hanover, it was now Hanover that was made subservient to England, as she might have been neutralized in the approaching contest and secured against the horrors of invasion to which she would now be left exposed.

Again, on the question of subsidies we cannot find that he ever 'clamoured' against them. On the 10th of May, 1739, when Carteret was in hot opposition, the Government proposed a subsidy to Denmark, and the employment of some thousands of Danish troops in the English service. Carteret spoke in favour of both. In 1741, when he was still in opposition, a subsidy was granted to Maria Theresa, and Carteret supported it. Pitt, without doubt, had clamoured in opposition against the subsidies and mercenaries which he consented to support in office. About this there can be no mistake. But we cannot find out that Carteret ever spoke against them at all. And even had he done so, we must bear in mind the distinction already pointed out. The resignation of Walpole and the accession of Carteret to power were coincident with events which changed the continental situation, and with it the responsibilities and obligations of all the leading statesmen of the period. When the House of Bourbon and the House of Hapsburg were again in deadly conflict, the prize being the Hegemony of Europe, it was hardly likely that the maxims and traditions, which had prevailed either in England or any other country before the conflagration broke out, should hold good after it was ablaze. Carteret happened to be in Opposition before the war, and in office after it began. It seems to us that these simple facts are quite

quite sufficient to account for any difference, if any can be found, between his language on the 'Hanoverian system' before he was Minister and afterwards, without imputing to him that he was a slave to ambition and moved only by selfish motives.

Carteret's views extended far beyond the mere establishment of Maria Theresa in her hereditary dominions, and embraced a much wider plan of action than his colleagues were capable of appreciating, or than the English nation was ever very likely to endorse. But if it was not practicable, it was bold and comprehensive, founded on an accurate knowledge of European politics, and conducive, we believe, to the real interests of Great Britain. What he really aimed at was the revival of the Grand Alliance, and the completion of the work left unfinished by the Treaty of Utrecht. That it was so left was acknowledged by Bolingbroke himself, whose reasons for negotiating peace in 1713 rested upon different considerations, and have always seemed to us conclusive,\* notwithstanding the admission here made. After that war we ought, he says, writing in 1749, to have husbanded our resources, and recruited our strength

'till we were prepared to take any part in future events, which our honour or interest might require. Nay, this scheme was the more necessary to be pursued; if France was left too powerful, no matter by whose fault, as I am ready to admit that she was; and if the two branches of Bourbon were to be looked upon in this century, like the two branches of Austria in the last, as inseparable allies, united by blood and by joint ambition.'†

It was supposed in 1713, and Lord Macaulay has repeated the argument, that to place a Bourbon on the throne of Spain would not have the effect of bringing France and Spain closer together. The new dynasty, it was said, would soon become naturalized, and show itself more Spanish than the Spaniards. But this is not what happened; and the manner in which Lord Macaulay ignores what actually took place is another illustration of his peculiar mode of writing history. No doubt in 1723 there was a quarrel between the two Courts. But it was soon made up, and the first of a series of Treaties, designed to establish a community of interests between the two Powers, and almost to weld them into one, was signed in 1733, though the world knew nothing of it for another quarter of a century.‡ It is now pretty generally understood that Spain received assurance of support from France in 1739, and it is a fact that

\* 'Quarterly Review,' vol. cccxxix. p. 207.

† 'State of the Nation,' p. 345, ed. 1759.

‡ Ranke's 'History of England.'

the French Government did afford valuable assistance to her ally in an indirect manner before the war broke out in Europe. In 1760 France and Spain stood side by side against England, in 1780 they did the same: and even after the French Revolution the Spanish fleet was placed at the disposal of France. We destroyed one Spanish armament at St. Vincent and another at Trafalgar. It is clear, therefore, that the danger apprehended from the combined forces of the House of Bourbon, the Neapolitan Bourbons\* included, was not imaginary, and that Carteret had excellent reasons for suggesting a European combination to nip it in the bud.

If it was madness, as Bolingbroke† in his bitterness designates it, at least it was a splendid madness, and something totally distinct from the mere peddling and truckling policy of which he was accused in England—a successful calumny which finally destroyed his power. But, in truth, it was no madness at all; and the measures adopted by Carteret for carrying it into effect during the very brief tenure of office, which was the only opportunity he enjoyed, seem to have been as wise as they were bold and farsighted.

His first object was to form, if possible, a united Germany, and to put a stop to those internal quarrels which constantly gave France the opportunity of interfering. When Carteret came into power, Prussia was at war with Austria, Maria Theresa both with Frederick and the new Emperor, Charles VII.; Germany, in fact, was a house divided against itself, and an easy prey therefore to the ambitious designs of her great military neighbour. The first thing Carteret did was to reconcile the King of Prussia and the Queen of Hungary, by the Treaty of Breslau, to which we have already referred. The second thing to be done was to secure, if possible, the co-operation of the Dutch. Carteret finding that Lord Stair's eloquence was unequal to the laborious task of making a Dutchman move, hurried over to the Hague himself in October, 1742, 'a fiery emphatic man,' says Carlyle, and did succeed at last in getting them to bestir themselves a little. 'We could see some three or four inches of daylight underneath them,' says the biographer of Frederick; 'and that was something.' Carteret's third attempt was on the Emperor, who must be severed from the French alliance as well as Frederick, if the great scheme was to succeed. With this object in view, conferences were opened at Hanau, the English head-quarters after the battle of Det-

\* Don Carlos, king of Naples, was compelled at the cannon's mouth to desist from joining France and Spain in August 1742.

† 'Marchmont Papers.'

tingen, when a satisfactory understanding was arrived at, which would have deprived France of all further excuse for intervening. Charles, on condition of regaining Bavaria, which Maria Theresa had conquered for herself, and receiving an annual subsidy from England for a certain number of years, consented to renounce his claims to the Austrian dominions, to give up the French Alliance, and to support the election of the Duke of Tuscany, Maria Theresa's husband, as King of the Romans, which would ensure his succession to the Empire. Frederick the Great was delighted with these terms, and entered cordially into the new alliance. Carteret persuaded Maria Theresa to relinquish the Electorate. The Dutch had already been gained. And it only remained to secure the consent of the English Cabinet for Carteret's statesmanlike combination to ripen into action.

This unfortunately was what Carteret was unable to obtain. The Duke of Newcastle, in a long but singularly weak letter,\* replied in the name of his colleagues, objecting to the proposed treaty chiefly on the ground, that it would not really have the effect of separating Charles from France. On this question, however, Carteret, who was on the spot and knew the parties thoroughly, must have been a much better judge than the other members of the Government; and, indeed we may take it for granted that the objection was only a pretext, and that the real motive was jealousy of Carteret himself, whom the Pelhams were determined to get rid of. Their game was to cause all his plans to fail, and then to use his failure as a ground for demanding his removal.

It would have been wiser in Carteret, had he consulted only his own reputation, to resign at once when he found his policy rejected by the Cabinet. But he conceived himself bound to stand by the King, and helped to negotiate the Treaty of Worms in the following September, by which Sardinia was secured to the allies. But his great blow had missed. And Mr. Carlyle does not overstate the case when he says that Carteret was 'ruined at Hanau.' He himself, though rather inclined to the rival theory of foreign policy, acknowledges the greatness of mind which pervaded Carteret's conception. His account of the Hanau negotiations is largely favourable to Carteret, and he even says that, had he only been King of England, grand results might have ensued. This opinion exactly coincides with Chesterfield's, who said that, as Minister of an absolute monarchy, he might have rivalled Richelieu.

---

\* Carteret MSS.

Had he been defeated in a fair fight between the two rival principles of foreign policy, his own namely and Bolingbroke's, we should feel less irritation at the event. Bolingbroke had tried the system of continental alliances against France, and was weary of it. His plan, the Tory plan, was to call home all our troops, throw our whole strength into the navy, harass the French and Spanish coasts by perpetual descents upon them, burning their ports, destroying their shipping, and annihilating their commerce, till they should be glad to make peace on any terms.\* On the other hand, Carteret, in common with the great Whig statesmen of the reign of Queen Anne, when there was no Hanover in question, thought that it was impossible for England to isolate herself; that she was safer in being a member of the European system, with her own allies and treaties to fall back upon in time of need, than in relying exclusively on her insular position; and, in short, that, if we were willing to let the Continent alone, the Continent would not let England alone, and that in the great struggle for supremacy which was always going on in Europe between the two strongest Powers for the time being, England, especially since the Revolution of 1688, was obliged to take a side. Had the Whig principle been set aside in favour of the Tory one, Carteret would have had less reason to complain. But that his own great designs should be traversed by the leaders of the Whig oligarchy, lending themselves to a factious intrigue of the lowest character, may well have disgusted him with the party system, and have suggested to him the possibility of crushing it. Its success in this instance had certainly been disastrous. It threw Frederick the Great, unable to rely on England's policy from day to day, into the arms of France, and prolonged a barren, bloody, and most costly struggle for another five years.

Such is a brief account of Carteret's well-concerted scheme for getting the French out of Germany altogether. That it originated solely in a desire to propitiate the Court is inconsistent, not only with Carteret's character, but with all the known facts. Carteret used the King to promote his European policy, instead of the King using Carteret to promote his Hanoverian policy. Carteret regarded Hanover as a means to an end. With George it was an end in itself. The scheme of a great German alliance to drive France back within her own borders had occurred to other Whigs besides Carteret.† But he was the only man among them with the genius and knowledge requisite for carrying it out, and had he been sole

\* 'Marchmont Papers,' vol. i. p. 31.

† Coxe's 'Horace Walpole,' vol. i. p. 48.



Minister, or even at the head of a united administration, it is possible that he might have been successful. But the state of parties in England in the reign of George II. rendered the unanimity, which existed at the beginning of Queen Anne's reign, impossible. It was Carteret's misfortune to be at the head of a divided Cabinet, and to experience all the evils for which divided Cabinets are famous. Bad enough at all times, they are intensified in time of war, as we felt to our cost in 1853; and ninety years before that they paralyzed the energies and ruined the career of the ablest Foreign Minister of the eighteenth century.

It is clear, however, that besides the jealousies and antipathies which prevailed within the Cabinet, and the difficulties of getting our continental allies to do their fair share of work, another great obstacle to the revival of the Grand Alliance lay in the new element imported into the European system by the growth of Prussia. Carteret's plan involved not only the maintenance but the extension of the Austrian ascendancy in Germany, and this did not suit with the incipient jealousy of the Hapsburgs, which was already beginning to show itself at Berlin. This was the new factor, with which the negotiators of another European coalition would have had to reckon, and of which it may be that Carteret did not all at once see the full importance. Had his abilities been allowed fair play, he might perhaps have overcome even this difficulty. But he was hampered by colleagues who thought more of mortifying him than of serving their country; and when the people of England woke up at last to a sense of the situation, and declared that the Revolution families should not be allowed to ruin England, it was Pitt, who stepped in at the eleventh hour and reaped the harvest of popularity and glory, which ought to have been Carteret's.

Carteret who had gone abroad with George II. in April, 1743, returned in the following November, and when Parliament met he was able, in spite of the failure at Hanau, to make out a good case for the Government.

'As the first work of his Ministry, Maria Theresa had been reconciled with Frederick, and that first great success had been followed up by the actual co-operation of the Dutch with England by the decisive defeat of the French in Germany, and by the successful agreement between Austria and Sardinia.'

But his days were numbered: nor was it his nature, as it was the Duke of Newcastle's, to linger on in suspense and uncertainty. In June, 1744, he told the Pelhams plainly that there was anarchy in the Cabinet, which either he or they must put an  
end

end to. They might take the Government if they pleased. If not, he would be First Minister himself, with all a First Minister's authority. Six months more of plotting and intriguing were necessary, however, to mature the arrangements of the conspirators; and it was not till the beginning of November that the pear was ripe. Then Newcastle, with the support of Lords Hardwick, Chesterfield, Lyttleton, Mr. Pitt, and many more, presented a memorial to the King, demanding Carteret's removal. The King consulted Lord Orford, and the upshot of it was that on the 24th of November, 1744, Carteret retired from office, but not from the Royal confidence, the continuance of which led up to the culminating point in Carteret's public life, and to a struggle which still has the deepest constitutional interest for us at the present day. Before proceeding to this passage in his life, we have wished to make it clearly understood what a really able man he was; that he was neither one of those erratic geniuses who are anxious for effect and nothing more, nor yet a mere obsequious courtier, willing to barter his own independence and his own principles for the favour of a king; but that, on the contrary, he was a man of solid attainments and vigorous intellect, with a definite object before him, which he pursued with great steadiness of purpose and great power of combination through his whole life. It may be as well, at this point, to gather up into a short compass the several opinions to this effect, which have been expressed both by his contemporaries and by subsequent writers, whose authority is universally recognized. Lord Chesterfield, when he heard that he was dying, said, 'when he dies, the ablest head in England dies too, take it all in all.' Horace Walpole, who was almost the hereditary enemy of Carteret, said he was the greatest genius he had ever known, superior to Sir Robert, superior to Lord Mansfield, and superior to Lord Chatham. What Chatham himself said of him is well known. He declared that 'in the upper departments of Government he had no equal;' adding that 'to his patronage, his friendship, and his instruction' he owed all he was. Carlyle and Lord Macaulay have both left behind them testimony to the same effect. Mr. Lecky speaks of him in still higher terms of admiration.

Special significance is to be attached to what Chesterfield says of his fitness to play the part of Richelieu; for it seems to us to place some aspects of his character in an altogether new light. And it is certain that he was willing at one time to stake his fortunes on a *coup d'état*, which if successful would have placed him, for a time at all events, in almost as powerful a position

a position as Lord Chesterfield describes. This then was the man who was selected by the Crown, in the middle of the eighteenth century, to overthrow the party dictatorship which the Whigs had set up, and who did not think the attempt hopeless.

It was not all at once that the Hanoverian family recognized the real character of the position, which those who had placed them on the throne of England intended them to occupy. For the first twenty years after the accession of George I. the King and the Revolution families believed themselves to be necessary to each other. The King was necessary to the Whigs, since without his favour they must lose all the political power which they had gained by the Revolution. But the Whigs, on the other hand, were not equally necessary to the King, as there was a large party in the country, not belonging to their connection, quite ready to maintain the Protestant succession. The 'Families' were always afraid that the King should find this out, and persisted to the very last, as Lord Shelburne tells us, in representing all the Tories as Jacobites. Some inkling of the real truth, however, seems to have dawned on George II. before the end of Sir Robert Walpole's administration; and when Walpole fell, and he had for the first time to form an administration of his own, he was prepared to act upon it.

We have seen that the Pelhams had succeeded in getting Carteret, now, by the death of his mother, Earl Granville, turned out of the Government. But the King continued to treat his Ministers with great coldness, and to keep up his confidential intercourse with Lords Bath and Granville. At length the Pelhams turned to bay, and peremptorily required of the King that he should admit Mr. Pitt to office. Lord Bath advised the King to refuse, and Lord Harrington, one of the Secretaries of State, meeting him coming out of the palace, gave him a foretaste of what was to come, by saying that those who dictated in private should be employed in public. Immediately afterwards both Harrington and Newcastle, the other secretary, resigned; and the King at once sent for Granville, and asked him to take both offices himself till other arrangements could be made. Granville agreed, and Lord Bath was made First Lord of the Treasury. Then the plot exploded. On the 11th of February the rest of the Ministry resigned in a body, and, with Charles Edward still at the head of an army, left the whole public business of the country to take care of itself.

It is important to remember, however, that this was the doing of the Families, whom the Pelhamite Whigs represented. For it is a most curious and significant fact, less known than it ought

ought to be, that the other section of the party, though they refused to act with Pulteney, would have supported Granville. Lord Hervey made him the offer. And had Granville chosen to throw over his colleague, he might have secured the Parliamentary support that was required. But as these men objected to Pulteney, and as the Tories objected to Granville, partly because he had, though under entirely changed conditions, supported the Hanoverian system, partly because they had been disappointed in 1742 of their share in the new government, and partly because they did not care to pick George II.'s prerogative out of the dirt for him—let it lie there—the two statesmen were thrown back upon their own resources. It was now discovered that no more than thirty peers and about eighty members of the House of Commons could be relied upon to back up the King. Pulteney was frightened, and behaved at the last moment with great precipitation and want of dignity. On the 12th of February he drove to the Palace, with Lord Carlisle, ostensibly with the object of presenting him to the Sovereign as one of the new Ministers. Instead of doing this he left him waiting in an ante-room, while he himself went into the royal presence, when he immediately told the King that all was over, and that the attempt must be abandoned. Having discharged himself of his task, he slunk out of the Palace by the back stairs, leaving Lord Carlisle to himself, and in the world of politics was no more seen or heard of.

Granville, however, was made of very different stuff. His spirits rose with the danger; and he would not hear of so gallant a scheme being ruined without a blow struck on its behalf. Let the King go down to the House of Commons in person, and throw himself on the loyalty of his subjects. An appeal to the nation against the tyranny of the oligarchy was worth trying. The King, it is said, 'prudently declined.' But in the judgment of the same writer,\* by whom Granville's advice has been preserved, there was as much weakness as prudence in the King's refusal. Richard Glover, the author of '*Leonidas*,' a warm Whig, and no friend to Carteret, says, in commenting on this affair, that 'could he have conveyed with his advice some part of his own manly and enterprising temper to the person advised, the attempt might have succeeded.' Mr. Ballantyne does not refer to this expression of opinion. But it is worth remembering. Glover, an influential member of the House of Commons, was intimate with all the great men of his own party; and we may be pretty sure that, in making

---

\* Glover's *Memoirs*.

this remark, he was only repeating what he had heard in the best-informed political circles. Horace Walpole inveighed very strongly against the behaviour of the Pelhams. Lord Bolingbroke thought that Granville had acted rightly, but regretted that the only result had been to make the King look contemptible; Granville himself, finding that nobody had the courage to stand by him in the course which he proposed, retired from the scene, smiling in 'his big contemptuous way,' as Carlyle says, at the mediocrities who had beaten him.

So ended the first attempt of the new Family to emancipate itself from the Venetian Constitution. It is supposed by many people that impatience of the restraints, imposed on the royal prerogative by what were called 'revolution principles,' began with George III. But it was no such thing. George II. made two attempts to establish the right of the Sovereign to choose his own Ministers, and was foiled in each. His successor had better luck. But it must be perfectly clear to all impartial students of this period that, as soon as the Hanoverian Princes began to feel at home in England, and familiar with the working of the Constitution, they began to chafe under the Whig system, and to resolve to shake it off at the first convenient opportunity.

Lord Shelburne's remarks on this affair are full of interest; and we must accept his authority as conclusive on all disputed points. Mr. Ballantyne seems to think, that Granville merely acquiesced in a design of which he disapproved in order to please the King. Such was evidently not Glover's opinion. Such was certainly not Lord Shelburne's opinion: while, to judge from Lord Chesterfield's description of Carteret, an attempt to govern without party support is just what we might have expected from him. 'The King,' says Shelburne, 'put himself into the hands of Lord Granville, who had full powers for a moment, but the Whigs at the instigation of the Pelhams signed a round robin against him, and the King did not choose to try the experiment which his grandson is about,\* nor was that time by any means ripe, I believe, for it, though Lord Granville thought otherwise.' From this passage we may learn three things: first of all, that Carteret was not regarded by Lord Shelburne as a regular Whig; secondly, that the experiment of 1746 was, at least on Granville's part, no mere sudden thought or forlorn hope suggested on the spur of the moment by the difficulties of the situation; but that it was entered upon more or less deliberately, as the result of previous consideration,

---

\* Written in the year 1800.

and in the belief, that the time had now arrived when it had a fair chance of being successful. Thirdly, we see that Lord Shelburne connects together as parts of one continuous design the plans of George III. and the plans of George II. In studying the constitutional history of the last century and a half, therefore, we must regard the efforts of the Sovereign in 1746 and 1757, in 1761 and 1783, in 1827 and 1834, to maintain the right of the Crown to choose its own ministers, as the periodical renewal of a constitutional protest against the Whig doctrine, serving to keep alive a prerogative which it might not always be convenient to enforce, but which it was impolitic to suffer to expire. What occurred during the Canning crisis in 1827 is specially to the point, for it seems certain that it was the representation made to George IV. that a section of the Tory aristocracy were trying to dictate to him, as the Whigs had dictated to his father, which determined him more than any other consideration to make Mr. Canning Prime Minister.

We have already referred to Lord Beaconsfield's observations on the unsuccessful enterprise of Carteret. It is glanced at in the 'Vindication of the British Constitution.' But it is from 'Sybil' that we prefer to quote, because the following passage corroborates the foregoing remarks, and increases the interest attaching to the name of Carteret. He says that 'the Patriot King'

'touched the heart of Carteret, born a Whig, yet sceptical of the advantage of that patrician constitution which made the Duke of Newcastle, the most incompetent of men, but the chosen leader of the Venetian party, virtually sovereign of England. Lord Carteret had many brilliant qualities: he was undaunted, enterprising, eloquent, had considerable knowledge of continental politics, was a great linguist, a master of public law, and, though he failed in his premature effort to terminate the dogeship of George II., he succeeded in maintaining a considerable though secondary position in public life. The young Shelburne married his daughter. Of him it is singular we know less than of his father-in-law, yet from the scattered traits some idea may be formed of the ablest and most accomplished minister of the eighteenth century. Lord Shelburne, influenced probably by the example and the traditionary precepts of his eminent father-in-law, appears early to have held himself aloof from the patrician connection, and entered public life as the follower of Bute, in the first great effort of George III. to rescue the sovereignty from what Lord Chatham called "the Great Revolution families."'

Carteret was not born a Whig; nor was he ever really a Whig on principle, though he acted with the party all his life. He was the representative of an old Cavalier family, and  
was

was educated, as Chesterfield tells us, 'in high monarchical notions,' which explains his readiness to lend his aid to George II. But all that Lord Beaconsfield says of his influence on Shelburne and Chatham is perfectly true. These names at once connect us with Pitt, and explain his conduct likewise. Pitt connects us with his great pupil Canning. And the influence of Canning has lasted to our own day.

Of all the many great qualities for which Lord Beaconsfield was remarkable, none was more conspicuous than his foresight. Though his opinion on the subject seems to have fluctuated, there were certainly periods of his life when he contemplated the possibility of such a modification of the party system as George III. and George II. aimed at, and as Carteret believed to have been possible. The dismissal of his Ministers by William IV. in 1834, when they commanded a Parliamentary majority, and the mere fact, that a statesman like Sir Robert Peel should have tried the experiment of a Government resting only on its own merits, and independent of party organizations, may well have strengthened such a belief half a century ago. Then for a time the system seemed to have regained its full vigour, and to have shaken off all the bad associations which had at various periods been connected with it. Now, however, in our own day, it seems once more to be on its trial, and all the popular distrust of it which existed a hundred years ago to have been kindled anew. Very hard things are said of it, both by public men and private men of all parties. Has the last word yet been said on the great constitutional question which was raised by George II. and Lord Carteret? Till this query can be answered positively and finally in the affirmative, the crisis described in these pages must always retain a lively interest for Parliamentary and historical students, and Lord Carteret remain the central figure of a scene still suggestive of important political possibilities.

After the failure of the great attempt in 1746, Granville remained out of office five years, and then, on the 17th of June 1751, became President of the Council, an office which he retained to his death twelve years afterwards. Carteret's second wife died within eighteen months of their marriage, leaving an only daughter, who married Lord Shelburne, afterwards the first Lord Lansdowne. Carteret, though he retained to the last his constitutional good spirits, was now a lonely, and after his fashion a disappointed man. He refused to mingle again in the strife of parties, though he might have done so had he pleased, for the Duke of Newcastle, in 1756, offered him the post of Prime Minister, and had he been ten years younger, he would doubtless,



less have made another effort to terminate the 'Dogeship.' He said at the time that it was a mad scheme, but that he was willing to try it again; meaning by this, that it was a very difficult, perhaps desperate undertaking, but that it was too good a stake not to be worth another throw. But Granville was now weary of the struggle; and had now perhaps more need than ever of his two bottles of Burgundy a day. According to Carlyle, he bore about him the outward token of his devotion to Bacchus, so that even in those convivial days he was noticeable for his red nose. But his spirit remained unabated, and the rebuke which he administered to Pitt at the Council Table is in our opinion highly creditable to him, though Carlyle is sorry for it, and Mr. Ballantyne tries to disprove it. It was in 1761, when Pitt threatened to resign, if war was not declared against Spain, and talked much at the council of being responsible to the people. Carteret said, 'when the gentleman talks of being responsible to the people, he talks the language of the House of Commons, and forgets that at this Board he is responsible only to the King.' This report, as Lord Stanhope points out (iv. 241), rests on the authority of Burke, who was at this time in an official position which gave him access to the best information. And we cannot set against this the statement of Almon, the bookseller, who said that he had heard Lord Granville deny that he had made the speech from which these words are taken. At all events, whether he did or did not, they were not unworthy of him; and show that he was true to the last to those 'high monarchical principles,' in which he had been educated, and which he kept pure and undefiled through fifty years' connection with Whiggism.

In December 1762 he was on his death-bed. But he lived long enough to express his warm approval of the Peace of Paris; and only a few days before the end he repeated to a friend the fine lines from the 'Iliad' which Sarpedon addresses to Glaucus, on the certainty of death and the effect which that certainty should have upon our actions:—

νῦν δ',—ἐμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεισῶσιν θανάτοιο  
 μυρίαί, ἃς οὐκ ἔστι φνυγεῖν βροτὸν οὐδ' ὑπαλύξαι—  
 ἴομεν,

and repeated the last word of all several times over, 'with calm and determined resignation.' 'Here,' says Mr. Matthew Arnold, quoted by Mr. Ballantyne, 'we see the English aristocracy at the very height of culture, lofty spirit, and greatness.' Let this be Carteret's epitaph. He died at Bath on the 2nd of January, 1763, and was laid among the bones of his ancestors in Westminster Abbey.

There

There are those who profess to see in the career of Carteret only a race for power, and in his support of the prerogative merely the means which he was obliged to use against the Parliamentary interest of his opponents. We have written to little purpose, if we have not done something to shake this unworthy conception of him. There are few public men whose motives will bear too close an analysis; few who have risen to greatness and retained it by such absolutely irreproachable methods as Burke or Pitt. Carteret's political morality savoured, no doubt, of the revolutionary period in which he had been bred. But if he loved power, he loved it like Chatham, for the sake of great objects. Had it been otherwise, he need never have relinquished it. He had framed a splendid scheme for the benefit of England and Europe; and he endeavoured so to employ the King's Hanoverian sympathies as to render them conducive to the common good. He was made to feel and understand the mischievous consequences of that debased and selfish Party system which the Revolution families were maintaining, and he fought against it the same battle which, though lost by himself, and again by his son-in-law, Shelburne, was finally to be won by the young Tory Minister, who once more made the King of England 'the most popular man in his dominions.'

---

- ART. IX.—1. *An Essay on the Commercial Principles applicable to Contracts for the Hire of Land.* By the Duke of Argyll, K.T. London, 1877.
2. *The Land Interest and Supply of Food.* By Sir James Caird, C.B., F.R.S.
3. *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland.* By John Bateman, F.R.G.S. Fourth edition. London, 1883.
4. *Hodge and his Masters.* By Richard Jefferies. London, 1880.
5. *The Making of Land in England: a Retrospect.* By Albert Pell, of Hazelbeach, Northamptonshire. 'Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England.' Second series, volume 23, October 1887.
6. *The Food Crop of the World.* By W. J. Harris. Supplement to the 'European Mail.' August 19th, 1887.
7. *Articles in 'The Morning Post.' The Church and the Land.* 1887.

THE astounding changes, which have taken place in the last ten or twelve years in the condition and prospects of the agricultural interests of this country, and consequently in the position of the owners and occupiers of land, have naturally called much attention to the present condition and future prospects of the landed interest. We live in a country having a limited area, densely populated, and abounding in great cities; yet we are unable to grow agricultural produce at a profit. Farms that formerly were eagerly sought for by numerous competitors, all substantial men with capital and credit, are now waiting in vain to be hired. Land, which was the favourite investment, and was in such demand that it not unfrequently fetched forty years' purchase on rents which were known to have been raised just before the sale, is at the present moment almost unsaleable. In Essex, but a few miles distant from the largest city in the world, there is a spot from which, it is said, there can be seen nineteen large farms, all vacant, without tenants, and for the most part uncultivated; this too in a county which only a few years back used to be one of our greatest food-producing districts. Fifty years ago we raised nearly all the corn required in the United Kingdom, supplies from foreign countries being only brought into requisition when the crops were damaged or deficient. Our population has now doubled, and we only supply a third of what they eat in the shape of bread. We are also dependent to a large extent on foreign countries for the supply of meat consumed at home; reckoning here, not only the actual meat imported, but also the meat-making

making substances, such as Indian corn, barley, oats, and linseed. It is estimated in this way that two-fifths of our animal food is produced directly or indirectly in other countries.

It is pointed out by Mr. Harris, that the home wheat crop of the present year is superior to that of last year, and is estimated at fifteen per cent. beyond the average; the available English crop being estimated at nine million quarters. The requirements of the population amount to twenty-six million quarters; leaving seventeen million quarters to be obtained from abroad. The stocks in hand being, probably, below the average, it is obvious we shall require this amount, in order to be at the end of a twelvemonth in the same position as we are in to-day.

The amount of corn available from other countries during the next twelve months is estimated as follows:—

|   | Quarters.  |
|---|------------|
| On passage .. .. .  | 2,000,000  |
| Available for shipment from the United States, to reach destination before August 1, 1888 .. .. . | 13,000,000 |
| Ditto, from Russia, ditto .. .. .   | 9,000,000  |
| Ditto, from India, ditto .. .. .  | 4,500,000  |
| Ditto, from Canada and Australasia, ditto .. .. .   | 3,000,000  |
| Ditto, from the rest of the world, ditto .. .. .  | 3,000,000  |
|   | <hr/>      |
|   | 34,500,000 |

The following is the manner in which it is estimated this output will be disposed of:—

|                              | Quarters.  |
|------------------------------|------------|
| United Kingdom .. .. .       | 17,000,000 |
| France .. .. .               | 1,500,000  |
| Belgium and Holland .. .. .  | 3,000,000  |
| Switzerland .. .. .          | 1,000,000  |
| Italy .. .. .                | 2,000,000  |
| Spain .. .. .                | 1,500,000  |
| West Indies, &c. .. .. .     | 2,000,000  |
|                              | <hr/>      |
|                              | 28,000,000 |
| Balance not required .. .. . | 6,500,000  |
|                              | <hr/>      |
|                              | 34,500,000 |

As oats, barley, hay, and green crops, which are principally used for the manufacture of meat, are during the present year lamentably deficient, and in some cases, especially as regards green crops, total failures, it is not too much to say, that we shall be a third short in our winter keep, and therefore those farmers who wish to fatten stock during the winter months

must invest largely in foreign feeding stuffs. The poverty of the majority of our farmers makes it almost impossible that they will be able to afford to fatten much stock this winter by the purchase of foreign food, so that the advantage of any increase in price of cattle will only benefit the foreigner, and to some extent our colonists.

According to these figures the outlook is singularly gloomy, and probably the agricultural year of 1887-1888 will be one of the worst this country has ever known. Of hay there is a deficiency of at least two million tons, and also a similar amount in straw; at the most favourable computation the deficiency in turnips is more than ten million tons, in oats four million quarters. It is stated that to replace these losses twelve million quarters of foreign barley would have to be forthcoming, viz. :—

|           |                               |     |        |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-----|--------|
| 4,000,000 | to replace deficiency in hay. |     |        |
| 2,500,000 | do.                           | do. | straw. |
| 2,500,000 | do.                           | do. | roots. |
| 3,000,000 | do.                           | do. | oats.  |

or else 4,000,000 quarters of oats more than are usually imported.

Although the crops of barley, oats, and maize, are unusually good in Russia and the Danubian Principalities, the demand for forward shipment, notwithstanding the low prices, is very small. Nothing is more indicative of the present dearth of capital amongst the British agriculturists than that, with the prospect of an almost certain profit by buying stock at the present ruinous prices and feeding it with Russian barley or oats or Danubian maize, at figures below anything known for a century, the trade in these articles remains undemonstrative, and values are little more than maintained.

The unremunerative prices of grain have been the cause of many acres of land once productive for tillage being laid down in grass; but as they are unsuited for grass and unproductive as pasture, they now, after great expense, only let for a few shillings, whereas a few years back they made pounds per acre.

At every turn the British agriculturist appears to be beaten out of the field; but he has laboured under some peculiar disadvantages. By the gradual depreciation of their currency the Russian, the South American, and the East-Indian farmers, enjoy a bonus on the production of food. It is said that the Russian farmer, by the depreciation of the paper rouble and the cheapening of carriage, now enjoys a greater advantage than he did ten or fifteen years ago, when prices in this country ruled

ruled far higher than they do now. Every 20*l.* received by the South American farmer means to him an equivalent of real purchasing power in his own country of 27*l.*, and in addition to this, the Government of the Argentine Republic offer a bonus on exports of meat and cattle. The East Indian farmer gains 28 per cent. in the rate of exchange, and has a premium on production to this amount over our farmers. In addition to this, it is estimated that the home farmer, by charges of various sorts, is taxed twelve per cent. on the value of his productions, while his foreign competitor has the advantage of our markets free.

The enormous imports that we annually make are regarded by the leading advocates of our present fiscal policy as a sign of wealth, being, they say, the exchange for British manufactures. Granting this to be the case, is it not possible, as Mr. Harris says, that we are ruining the most useful and healthy industry of the country, in order to stimulate others not so essential to our national well-being? However this may be, it is certain that we are passing through a period of depression in agriculture without a precedent in the history of this country, and that probably we have worse times before us. The landowner is becoming rapidly impoverished. Many of the most beautiful country-seats and stately parks are deserted by their owners, and are becoming neglected, not to say ruinous. Thousands of tenant-farmers, who some years ago were capitalists, have or will have to compound with their creditors, and abandon an occupation which has been the mainstay, either directly or indirectly, of at least one-third of the population of our three Islands; for we have to take into consideration, not only the persons actually engaged in and dependent on agriculture, but the inhabitants of our country-towns who are dependent on the district in which they are situated. The agricultural labourer, who is always the last to gain or to suffer from economic changes, and who, owing to the cheapness of food and clothing, with only a slight diminution in wages, has not suffered to the same degree as the two classes above mentioned, finds that depressions of the present kind cannot continue long without affecting him, and that he has difficulty in obtaining employment.

Sir James Caird states that the class of landowners, whose position, duties, and influence, render them holders of a high social position, comprise a body of about 180,000 persons, who possess among them the whole of the agricultural land from 10 acres and upwards. The owners of less than 10 acres each do not hold more than one hundredth part of the land, and to a great extent are householders only. The accumulation of a large

large extent of land in the possession of a small number of proprietors becomes very remarkable when the landowning class is closely analyzed. One-fourth of the whole territory of the United Kingdom, excluding properties under one acre in extent, is held by 12,000 persons, at an average for each person of 16,200 acres; another fourth by 6200 persons, at an average of 3150 acres; one-fourth by 50,770 persons, at an average of 380 acres; while the remaining fourth is held by 261,830 persons, at an average for each person of 70 acres. A few years back, there were 1,160,000 persons engaged as cultivators of the soil; these, when added to the owners of land of one acre and upwards, comprise about one-fifth of the total male adult people of the United Kingdom; and it is therefore clear that the people of this country have no insignificant stake in landed property.

Mr. Bateman has computed, in the work now under our notice—which, besides being interesting to those who are pleased to examine the affairs of their neighbours, is a valuable compendium of the principal owners of land in this country—that there were in 1883, 44 owners of 100,000 acres of land and upwards, 71 owners of between 50,000 and 100,000 acres, 299 owners of between 20,000 and 50,000 acres, 487 owners of between 10,000 and 20,000 acres, 617 owners of between 6000 and 10,000 acres, and 982 owners of between 3000 and 6000 acres. There were at the same date 15 landed incomes of 100,000*l.* and upwards, 51 of between 50,000*l.* and 100,000*l.*, 259 between 20,000*l.* and 50,000*l.*, 541 between 10,000*l.* and 20,000*l.*, 702 between 6000*l.* and 10,000*l.*, and 932 between 3000*l.* and 6000*l.*

Sir James Caird estimates that, ten or twelve years ago, the property of the landowners, independently of minerals, yielded an annual rent of 67 millions sterling, and was worth 2000 millions sterling. He points out that there is no other body of men in the country, who administer so large a capital on their own account, or whose influence is so widely extended or so universally present. From them the learned professions, the Church, the Army, and the Public Services, are largely recruited. The loss that has been entailed upon the owners of land during the last ten years has been lately estimated at about 300 millions; but we are inclined to think it a great deal more. Landed incomes have not only been largely depreciated, but those incomes, instead of being capitalized as they formerly were, and as Sir James Caird has capitalized them, at thirty years' purchase, can now certainly not be capitalized in England and Scotland at more than twenty-five years' purchase, and in Ireland at considerably less. The gross annual value of land  
assessed



assessed to the income-tax in 1875 was 66,911,000*l.*; that is, 50,125,000*l.* in England, 7,493,000*l.* in Scotland, and 9,293,000*l.* in Ireland. In 1879-80 the assessment rose to 69,548,796*l.* In the year 1885-86 this gross assessment declined on the new valuation for that year to 63,268,679*l.*; that is, 45,993,545*l.* in England, 7,320,599*l.* in Scotland, and 9,954,535*l.* in Ireland—thus showing a decrease of 6,280,117*l.*; to this decrease should be added the capital value of the tax ultimately discharged from the assessment on the ground of agricultural distress, or actually repaid in money in respect of the year 1885-86, amounting to 732,000*l.*, which may probably be considered permanent; thus, the total apparent decline by the assessments up to 1885-86 from 1879-80 has been 7,012,117*l.* This rental was worth a few years ago 30 years' purchase, or 210,363,510*l.* The depreciation of 5 years' purchase on the capital value of the net assessment of 1885-86 would represent 312,683,395*l.*, making the total capital loss to the landlords alone of 523,046,905*l.* The loss to the occupiers of land, considering the depreciation in the value of live-stock, and the heavy losses in hard cash entailed by the wet seasons and otherwise, cannot be estimated at less than 25 per cent. of their entire capital, which would be about 100,000,000*l.* According to these figures, the total loss since the year 1879-80 to owners and occupiers would be upwards of 600,000,000*l.* These are big figures, but we believe they can be more than sustained, as it is well known that since the year 1885-86 further very large reductions have taken place all over the United Kingdom, and there is still the prospect of falling rents.

The whole question of rent has been much discussed during the last few years. The followers of Mr. George argue, that rent merely represents the surplus from the produce of the land after all working expenses have been paid, and the farmer has got a fair return for his labour and the capital he has invested in stocking his holding; they then go on to say, that at present prices there is no surplus, and therefore the landowner is not entitled to, and should not have, any rent. A short examination however of this argument shows, that it will hardly hold water. Agriculture is an industry that requires perhaps more capital than any other: the landlord finds four-fifths of this capital in the shape of houses, buildings, drainage, fences and gates, roads, and soil improvements, &c. &c.; the tenant finds the remaining fifth in stock and implements. The argument then of the extreme party is, that the tenant, in addition to a fair payment for his labour, is entitled to receive a good rate of interest for his money, while the owner of the soil

is

is to receive little or none upon the four-fifths which he has found to work the partnership. The fact is, rent is only a fairly moderate interest asked by the capitalist for the amount of money he has tied up on the land he owns. Nothing is more untrue than that it is the land as land only, *i.e.* raw land, that the landlord lets to the farmer. Except in the case of allotments and small parcels of accommodation land in the neighbourhood of towns, there is in England at present very little rent paid in respect of land as land only. With the exception of the Chalk Downs, there is now practically no raw land in England; it has all had labour and capital expended on it. We could point to numbers of farms now let at from 250*l.* to 300*l.* per annum, on which the capital expended for houses, buildings, fencing, and drainage, cannot have been less than 5000*l.* to 6000*l.* The owner of the soil, therefore, is only receiving 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. on the capital that he has expended. Considering that this percentage is in respect of perishable works, which he has to keep in repair with very little assistance from the occupier, it cannot be denied that the interest he gets is very moderate; for the land he gets nothing, or next to nothing.

There is another item, which is often lost sight of, but which has always to be furnished at the landlord's expense. The labourers who are employed by the farmers have to be housed; and cottages in considerable numbers have, therefore, to be provided. There was a time, no doubt, when the habitations of the labouring poor in agricultural districts were not by any means good; but great strides have been made in this direction during the last twenty years; and at the present day, on most estates, the dwellings of the labourers will stand the strictest scrutiny, and are immeasurably superior to the houses of the labouring poor in towns. A good pair of labourers' cottages, even if they are of the plainest description, cannot be built for less than 300*l.* to 350*l.*; generally they cost about 400*l.* a pair, often considerably more. They are let on an average at 2*s.* per week, or 5*l.* 4*s.* per annum, the landlord doing all repairs and paying all rates and taxes; they therefore cannot be reckoned to pay more than 2 per cent., notwithstanding that they are perishable and after certain periods of time have to be renewed.

The question, however, of what rent the landlord *ought* to get if he started on fair terms—sharing profit and loss with the tenant in accordance with their respective investment in the enterprise—must necessarily be considered with the question of what rent he *can* get in the market open to him. The landlord's contribution is vastly greater than the tenant's, and, if both

both are treated as capitalists, and are to win or lose 'pro rata,' the tenant's share of the loss would be larger, and the landlord's smaller, than it is. The tenant, however, though a capitalist, is not one who would be content to live on the interest of his capital—at all events, not such interest as the landlord is willing to receive in respect of his share of the capital. Of course, the tenant is entitled to some remuneration for his time and labour; but, putting this at the most liberal computation, the amount would be considered by most occupiers of land a very insufficient return for their capital and labour. We venture to say, that a farmer starting with a capital of 1000*l.* will consider himself entitled to live in such style as a retail tradesman, commencing business with the same amount of capital, would not dream of; yet the tradesman will work harder than the farmer, and ought to have greater remuneration for his labour and as much interest for his capital.

Under these circumstances, the landlord has to be content with what he can get in the shape of rent, which is now generally represented by the surplus after the tenant has earned enough to keep himself and his family, and in theory has maintained the fertility of his farm. The bargain, however, is essentially one-sided, and is most disadvantageous to the landlord; there is no other commercial enterprise in which people will invest money on such terms. We do not think that the relative share and liability of the two partners concerned in agricultural enterprise, and the extent to which one partner (the tenant) can injure the business, has ever been sufficiently recognized.

Every landowner or land agent can tell of instances—now, we regret to say, more numerous than ever—where farms have been almost ruined by bad tenants, and have only been got in order again by the landlord at great expense; the tenant, in nine cases out of ten, escaping without any payment. Three years of really bad farming can reduce a farm from a state of good cultivation to a ruinously poor condition, and the landlord has no practicable remedy.

The Canadian and United States farmers, when they settle upon a tract of land which they may have had granted to them by Government for nothing, or for which they only paid a small sum of money, have to borrow, at eight, ten, or twelve per cent., to build houses, drain, clear, irrigate, plant, and otherwise develop the land, and construct a farm out of a wilderness. Although they may get the land for nothing, they pay in proportion a higher rent than the English farmer does, in the interest that they pay on those loans; and in addition, there is this difference—that as in England bad times are met

met by a reduction of rent, and consequently a diminution of the interest paid on the capital invested in agriculture, the American farmer has, on the contrary, in bad times to pay a higher rent than he would in good times. When wheat gets below 50 cents a bushel, the American farmers make no profit, and the capitalists, fearing their money is in danger, will no longer lend without higher interest. Thus, while our farmers are obtaining their loans at three per cent. per annum, or less, the American farmers are often paying three per cent. per month. Under these circumstances it may be asked, How is it that the American farmer can undersell the English farmer? As we have already pointed out, the English farmer never has competed on equal terms with his foreign competitor; and in addition to the bonuses to the foreign or the colonial producer attendant on the depreciation in currency, the English farmer is, by charges of various sorts, taxed to the extent of twelve per cent. on the value of his produce. There is also no doubt, that the capital invested by the British landowner in his farms is very much larger than that invested by the American freeholder; and consequently the tenant-farmer of England, although he enjoys a much more luxurious home, and his farm-buildings are much superior to those on any American farm, has to pay interest on a larger amount of capital. The principal reason why English and Scotch farmers have been reckoned, until within the last few years, the best and most successful agriculturists in the world, is that so large an amount of capital has been invested by the landowner; in consequence of which the land has been better fenced, better drained, and the cattle and stock have had the advantage of being housed in better farm-buildings.

It must be remembered that the greater part of the soil of England has, during the last two hundred years, been enclosed, and changed, almost entirely at the landowners' expense, from comparative waste into flourishing fertility; and, although portions of land out of the enclosure have often been sold to defray the cost of the legal and surveyors' charges and the formation of roads, these expenses, which form but a small part of the eventual outlay of the owner, have also in numerous instances been raised by a rate representing a cash payment to every person interested. After the initiatory expenses of the legal and surveyors' charges, &c., have been met, the really heavy outlay of the freeholder begins. The farmhouses, buildings, and cottages were in the most part a mass of miserable tenements, all huddled together in the nearest village, which, besides being generally in a dilapidated, not to say ruinous, condition,

condition, were quite unsuited for the new farms into which the land dealt with under the enclosure was to be divided. The whole of the land had then to be fenced ; new farmhouses, buildings, and cottages to be erected ; the land to be drained, which it never was under the open field system, on account of the impossibility of draining the small detached pieces of land ; portions of the waste land had to be broken up, and other portions of the arable land to be laid down in grass ; and, in fact, an immense expenditure had to be made by the landlord before he could reap any benefit from the enclosure. Whatever may be urged against enclosures—and possibly they have been the means of inflicting some hardships upon the poorer classes of the community—still it must be admitted, that by exchanging the miseries of the open field and ill-drained waste, for fertile districts with good roads and footpaths, they have been attended with an undoubted advantage to the community at large, and have made two blades of grass grow where one grew before.

The Duke of Argyll, referring to the subject, says :—

‘There was a time, beyond all doubt, when both the ownership of land and the mode of occupying it for the purposes of cultivation were communistic. When “wild in the woods the noble savage ran,” his idea of property in the soil was his idea of the hunting-ground of his tribe. And when the cultivation of the soil began, that cultivation was very generally, if not universally, carried on by village communities—no one individual of which was allowed to retain possession of any portion of the soil longer than was requisite for the reaping of a single crop. The passage from communistic to individual ownership, and again from communistic to individual farming, has been simply the passage from barbarism to civilization. Communistic cultivation or tenancy has survived much later than communistic ownership. The solitary tenant-farmer who now holds for an indefinite time, or for a long and certain term of years, an exclusive right to cultivate even a single field, is a much more modern invention than the owner who holds a large estate in fee. There are whole counties in Scotland in which every farm now occupied by individual farmers was held, and that not very long ago, by many cultivators, and sometimes by whole “village communities.” The history of this change is the history of the progress of agriculture in Scotland from a very low to a very high condition. It has been the change from men living in smoke, squalor, and periodical starvation, to men conducting, perhaps, the most prosperous agriculture existing in the world. I am myself owner of a farm which, within my own memory, was cultivated by eighteen tenants, each of whom had sometimes more than a hundred separate bits of land, which changed hands every year, and the allocation of which was determined by lot. In this way about eighty-six arable acres were cut up into above two thousand fragments, many of which were not larger than sufficed to grow

grow a single "stook" of corn. The old communistic idea was, that as the land varied in quality, and as all the lots could not therefore be of equal value, it was unjust that any one man should have any permanent possession of any one portion of the ground. The same barbarous system was not long ago universal among the small cultivators of the Highlands; it still survives in some parts of Ireland; and in all probability it once prevailed over a large portion of the kingdom.'

The very interesting article by Mr. Pell, published in the October number, 1887, of the 'Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England,' shows that the capital expenditure on land, to provide it with proper farm-buildings and bring it into a food-producing state, has often cost more per acre than the land with all its improvements has ever been subsequently worth. One instance is given of a moor of heather which was brought under cultivation at a cost of 24*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* per acre, more than half of which was for liming, the effect of which cannot be regarded as permanent. The rental for this was valued at 6*s.* 8*d.* per acre—an increase of 5*s.* 8*d.* per acre, little more than one per cent. on the capital employed. Before the land was reclaimed it was a splendid grouse-moor, which would have commanded a game-rent of 2*s.* 6*d.* per acre. This had to be sacrificed; and deducting it from the increased rental of 5*s.* 8*d.* per acre the net financial gain is only 3*s.* 2*d.* per acre, or a return of about 13*s.* per annum on an expenditure of 100*l.* This case furnishes a very striking and useful proof of the need of caution and moderation on the part of those, who would fasten on owners a legal obligation to bring waste lands and grouse-moors into cultivation. If under State compulsion the improved condition of the land had to be preserved, the liming would have to be renewed at a cost which, at the present prices of produce, would hardly be remunerative. The average sum of owners' expenditure on all classes of cultivated farm-land is estimated at 26*l.* per acre. Houses and buildings have also to be repaired and rebuilt, liming and chalking have to be perpetually renewed, and under-drainage has to be constantly attended to, and renewed altogether after a certain period; the longest term for which they are efficient being fifty years, and this under exceptional circumstances. It is a mistake to suppose that, even in the finest grazing pastures of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, the extraordinary richness of their grasses is due entirely to nature. Experiments have been made which show that, even in these splendid districts, linseed- and cotton-cake have been used in large quantities for many years, and this has undoubtedly helped to make them what they are.

It

It is the capitalist who has gradually given to the soil of England its present character and appearance, and to whose outlay the nation is indebted for its great fertility and productiveness; but this is very little recognized. A curious illustration of the manner, in which the necessary capital required from the owner of the soil is ignored, has recently been brought under our notice.

A large landowner in the Southern Counties of England—a man of most liberal mind, and anxious for any reforms affecting landed property that could in any way benefit the neighbourhood in which he resides or the community at large—received through the secretary of a local Liberal Club a memorial from eighty of the better class of labouring men upon his estate, asking him to let to them, at fair rents, small portions of land varying from one to fifty acres, the total applied for being some hundreds of acres. We may say in parenthesis, that the estate in question already contains a very large allotment system, 600 acres (out of a total of 11,000, including the park and woodlands, which are extensive,) being let out in this manner. Directly the landlord received the applications, he wrote a letter expressing approval of the idea, and his willingness, if it were practicable, to grant the request. But he pointed out, in addition to the difficulty that existed in disturbing present tenancies, that he must know exactly what was required of him: Did the proposal merely mean an application to let the land, or did it mean that the land should be fenced to suit the various occupations, and be fully equipped with farm-buildings, in order that it might be properly worked and a proportion of live-stock kept? If the latter were the case, the amount of capital required would be prohibitory to the owner, especially looking at the fact that the land had already been laid out, fenced, and equipped with buildings to suit larger holdings, which then existed, and which would for the most part be sacrificed. In answer to this, the applicants had to confess that an equipment of buildings in some sort was absolutely necessary, and that the business of the farms could not be carried on unless they were properly fenced and laid out. The landlord's agent, having made a calculation, found that, in order to lay out the land to suit the applicants and furnish the lands with the most bare equipment of buildings, a capital sum would be required the interest of which at 5 per cent. would be considerably more than the rent that the land then let for. Yet the applicants only proposed to pay the present market value of the land as it stood, and had assumed, or the Liberal Club had assumed for them, that the owner of the soil would find this capital practically free of interest, and take all the risk of the undertaking into



into the bargain. The landowner, still being desirous of extending the system of small holdings for the benefit of the agricultural poor, even at some loss to himself, then offered, as the applicants were not in a position to buy the land, that, if an intermediary capitalist could be found who would erect the buildings, and furnish the other necessary requirements, he would be willing to sell to the capitalist the land required on a system of deferred payment, so much yearly for rent, plus an instalment towards the principal of the purchase-money, the capitalist adopting a similar system with the occupiers of the land. The applicants, however, say that they would prefer to deal with the owner without an intermediary; and so the matter stands. From this case, it will be seen that it is the tendency to ignore entirely the fact of the vast amount of capital required from the landlord, and to look upon farmhouses, cottages, buildings, roads, fences, &c., as if they grew spontaneously upon the soil.

Besides those who are directly connected with the land, there is a large class who are very largely interested in it, namely, the mortgagees. There are few large estates which are entirely free, and many are heavily encumbered. These loans or mortgages have, to some extent, arisen out of our present land system. As estates come to the eldest sons, the younger children have to be provided for, and those landowners, who have not been able out of their income to make such provision, have had to charge the estates with portions for each child. The family property has frequently been largely added to, the acquisition of the adjoining land, when for sale, being considered indispensable; and the owner, if he had not the ready cash available, borrowed the purchase money, charging the entire estate, old and new, with the amount. These transactions have generally been most disastrous to landlords, especially since the recent fall in values, as they are now often paying 4 per cent. for money invested in land which pays them 1 or 2 per cent.

Mortgages are largely held by insurance companies, friendly societies, and public philanthropic and other institutions; thus spreading indirectly an interest in the welfare of the land through every class of the nation. It is well known that many of these mortgages are for immense sums, and would at the present moment be most difficult to realize. Nothing is harder in these days than to shift a big mortgage on a landed estate, especially, as is very often the case now, the margin between the net rent and the interest of the loan is a narrow one. The mortgagee, therefore, who wanted his money back again, would in all probability have to foreclose, and try his hand at a sale of the estate. Foreclosure, however, has its difficulties, and is  
always

always a disagreeable process, consequently it is seldom resorted to. As long as the mortgagee gets his interest and feels reasonably secure, he is content to hold on, in the hope of something turning up; he knows he cannot realize without great trouble and risk, and he hesitates to face the difficulty.

When we consider the immense sums that the public life insurance companies are reputed to have locked up as loans on land, and the fact that the funds of these companies represent the savings of a very large number of the community of all classes, we find that the stake of the nation in the land is greater and more widely distributed than may be supposed. People fail to recognize the ruin which has come upon the agricultural interest; yet it has been publicly stated by a well-known member of Parliament who has made agricultural matters a study, and who is well versed in them, that if we lost the whole of our foreign trade—were such a thing possible—the loss to the country would not be greater than the loss inflicted by the ruin of the agricultural interest.

The question of rent, therefore, is not a landlord's, tenant's, and labourer's question only—it is one affecting many classes of the community, and more perhaps than they have any idea of. If rent continues to fall, as it probably will, many people who now laugh in their sleeves at the distressed landlords will have a rude awakening.

As connected with the question of rent, we should perhaps say a few words on the subject of tithe rent-charges. These have lately been much attacked, and, curiously enough, they have been attacked by the tenant-farmers, who are in no way interested in the subject. It is true that, in a great many instances, the tithe is paid by the tenant on behalf of the landlord; but this is a subject of agreement between himself and the owner of the farm he takes. He hires a farm at 30*s.* an acre, 25*s.* of which rent he is to pay to the landlord, and the remaining 5*s.* to the owner of the tithe rent-charge. The occupier of the land does not appear to see that, as long as there is any margin of rent beyond the amount of the tithe, it cannot be a question affecting him, but affecting the owner of the soil who has this permanent charge upon his property. If land, on which there is a rent-charge of 5*s.* an acre, becomes so depreciated in the market that it is only worth 10*s.* per acre, the tenant will, if he undertakes to pay the tithe, pay 5*s.* to the landlord and 5*s.* to the tithe-owner; but he is in no way affected himself—it is immaterial to whom he pays the rent; and whether half of it goes to the rector or vicar of the parish, or the lay impropiator, or to the landlord, is only a question affecting those personages themselves. The tenant-farmers' agitation against tithe is practically,

practically, though unconsciously, an altruistic appeal on behalf of their landlords. It must be borne in mind that all estates, that have been sold since the passing of the Tithe Commutation Acts of 1832, have been sold subject to these tithe rent-charges; and that the Acts themselves were passed by a Parliament for the most part consisting of persons interested in the soil, and with the full approval and concurrence of the landowners.

No doubt unforeseen circumstances have arisen, which have made some cases of tithe rent-charge appear oppressive; as when heavy clay arable land, which was formerly most productive of good wheat crops, and consequently has a high rent-charge, has been laid down to grass, for which it is quite unsuited, and the rent for which is barely sufficient to cover the amount of tithe. An instance of this has been brought recently to our notice. A farm in the south of England containing 600 acres, for the most part arable land, has been let for some time past for 200*l.* per annum, the tenant paying the rates and the landlord the tithe, the commuted amount of which is 205*l.*, so that the landlord paid more in tithe than he received in rent. In addition to this, however, the landlord had to keep the farm-house and buildings in repair, and he had also to pay 280*l.* per annum as interest and capital on a loan, raised some years back, to build a new farm-house and buildings and to drain the farm. The payment in respect of this loan has still several years to run, and the unfortunate owner is at present some hundreds per annum out of pocket by the property. This is certainly a hard case, and worthy of the attention of the tithe-owner, since if the proprietor were to let the farm go out of cultivation the tithe-owner would get nothing.

There is also another matter on which the landlords have perhaps some cause for grievance, namely, the manner in which the Averages of the price of corn are taken. These averages regulate the value of the commuted amount of rent-charge, and they are for the most part taken from the returns of the clerks of certain markets. For some years past, since the price of corn has become so low, only the best qualities are sent by the farmers to market, as damaged or tail-corn is practically unsaleable, and is therefore consumed by the farmers on their holdings as food for their cattle and sheep. In the wet season of 1879 hardly any corn, except what was gathered under most favourable circumstances, found its way into the markets, which make returns for the tithe averages; and consequently the price of corn, as given by the clerks of those markets, did not in any way represent the actual average value of the entire yield of corn for the year, on which the tithe is supposed to be based. The average is also raised in some districts

tricts by the operations of the trade. The same corn is sold at one market, only to be resold at a higher price by the corn-dealer at other and better markets.

If however the tithe-owner has, in some respects, been better off than many who are dependent for their income on the produce of the soil, the same cannot be said of those ministers of the Church who are unfortunate enough to derive the income of their benefices from glebe farms. Some interesting articles have lately appeared in the pages of a contemporary, on the 'Church and the Land,' which give a lamentable account of the distress among the clergy, resulting from the diminished rent of glebe farms, or from their absolute want of tenants. Many clergymen are unable to find the capital to work these vacant farms; and yet, if the land is allowed to go out of cultivation, the clergy or their representatives, on the living being vacated, are liable for dilapidations. The following shows the condition of some who are dependent on glebe lands:—

'In the diocese of Ely the average amount of glebe is 88 acres to each benefice, and some livings have from 500 to nearly 1,100 acres. In the parish of A the rent 10 years ago was 1,406*l.*; the charges, including rates and taxes, 686*l.* (of which about 400*l.* is for fen drainage); and the curate's stipend £150; leaving a net income of 570*l.* Now, the rent, when it is all paid (which seldom happens), is 880*l.*, while the outgoings are as before, and the net income, therefore, amounts to the magnificent sum of 44*l.* In parish B the glebe consists of 508 acres, of which 33 are in grass, and the rest arable, the rent having been formerly 813*l.* For nearly four years 205 acres were unoccupied; while now, although most of the land is let, the rent has dropped to 390*l.*; and as, not long ago, there was a sum of 524*l.* tithe rent-charge in arrear, it may be imagined that this once rich living is not in a flourishing condition. In benefice C the glebe consists of 270 acres, mostly arable, and 15 years ago the rent was 500*l.* But since the depression only 100 acres have been let, at 1*l.* per acre, and the incumbent is struggling to maintain a large family on that sum and on the produce of the remaining 170 acres which he is unable to let, and must farm as well as he can, or, in other words, at a loss. In parish D the glebe of 436 acres used to fetch 600*l.* a year. Of this 200 acres are now in hand from the impossibility of getting a tenant, and are bringing in less than the outgoings; 110 acres of grass are let for 110*l.*, 28 acres of clover for 10*l.* 10*s.*, and a few small pieces for sums which, after payment of all charges, scarcely leave even starvation wages for the rector. In parish E, 355 acres, formerly let at 500*l.*, are being farmed by the incumbent at a heavy loss. In parish F, 560 acres, which formerly produced 600*l.*, are now let at 250*l.*, out of which a charge of about 100*l.* a year has to be paid to Queen Anne's Bounty. In parish G the rent of 245 acres has dropped from 394*l.* to 50*l.*, though the rector

has sunk 8000*l.* of his own capital on the land, an expenditure of which he will never be recouped one farthing. In parish H, where the income is solely derived from glebe, the incumbent, at the age of 83, found his means of living suddenly reduced from 180*l.* to 40*l.* a year. Another, in very similar circumstances, died heart-broken, not so much from regret at the loss of personal comfort as from distress at being no longer able to help his people; and I could not help thinking that, in the words of Eothen, "the old man had got rather well out of the scrape of being alive and poor." If it were not for the fear of wearying your readers, I could easily give scores of instances within the one diocese of Ely in which the same sort of thing has taken place. I have the names of 20 livings, mostly in Bedfordshire, Suffolk, and Huntingdon, with aggregate glebe of just under 7000 acres, or an average of 350 acres each. Ten years ago the rental was over 12,000*l.*, or about 35*s.* an acre, the average being 600*l.* apiece. It is now 3731*l.*, being less than 11*s.* an acre, or 186*l.* to each benefice; and even this amount is subject to large deductions for charges of various kinds. If the reader of these lines will picture to himself his own position if his entire income, whatever it may be, were suddenly reduced to one-third of its amount, he will have some notion of the unfortunate position of many of the clergy in what used to be the finest wheat-growing districts in England.'

Statistics only cannot represent or estimate the anxiety and privation which are borne by many of the clergy. Clergymen are not by education men of business; and when, perhaps with borrowed capital, they have to conduct farming operations, at which even experts are losing money, it is not to be wondered that the results are disastrous.

Landed incomes, on which income-tax to the full amount is paid, are very different from incomes derived from other forms of investment. Few people have any idea of the annual outlay needed to keep up a large estate, especially if there are a mansion and park, out of which the public often get more enjoyment than the actual owner. The small net amount left to the possessor of an estate, after he has paid for its maintenance and has responded to the many calls upon him, would surprise most people who are not practically acquainted with the subject. When we reflect that, in addition to the necessary expenditure to work the land, the landlord has frequently to pay interest on mortgages raised by his predecessors, and charges and annuities made in respect of members of his family, it will be a matter of wonder that so many have been able to hold their own during these adverse times; and it is evident that, if affairs get worse, or even continue in their present state, the ruin of many is inevitable, and that the landed interest will be unable to support the further burdens with which

which it is often threatened. No incomes are less selfishly spent than those derived from the rents of landed property. The expenditure of the income of a large estate not only finds employment for a great number of persons, but it gives great pleasure to a large portion of the community. Most parks are now thrown open to the public, who have the right to drive over miles of well-kept roads, to the expenses of which they do not in any way contribute. The same may be said of the gardens, pleasure-grounds, and general surroundings of any large country place, which are almost always thrown open, or can be seen on certain days. A proprietor might, if he sold his land, invest the proceeds in the funds or otherwise; and if he chose could spend the money on himself; he would be less open to critical attack than would a landowner who expends the greater part of his income on an estate, the amenities of which the general public to a large extent share, and in charities and enterprises for the general benefit of the neighbourhood in which his property is situated.

We have been enabled to examine the expenditure of incomes recently derived from certain large estates, and we doubt whether there are any incomes better administered. We give some figures which present a fair sample of the expenditure on a well-managed property. The estate from which they are taken used, some few years back, to produce about 24,000*l.* per annum; it now produces about 21,000*l.*; but an abatement of rent has to be made on the agricultural land in addition to rents that have been permanently reduced. There is a considerable amount of house property in the neighbouring town, and this, together with accommodation and allotment land, has not been subject to abatement, so that the actual fall in the income with the abatement returned is in respect of the farms only. We give the average income for the last three years, and the average expenditure under various headings for a like time:—

| RECEIPTS.                                       |         | PAYMENTS.                     |         |
|---|---------|-------------------------------|---------|
|   | £       |                               | £       |
| Park and woods .. .. .                          | 1,125   | Park and woods .. .. .        | 2,040   |
| Gardens .. .. .                                 | 188     | Gardens and pleasure-ground.. | 650     |
| General estate .. .. .                          | 19,498  | New works and general repairs | 5,098   |
| Schools (fees and grants) ..                    | 90      | (not including mansion) ..    |         |
| Clothing clubs (members' pay-<br>ments) .. .. . | 162     | Tithes, &c. .. .. .           | 1,622   |
|   |         | Rates and taxes .. .. .       | 1,260   |
|   |         | Schools .. .. .               | 411     |
|   |         | Subscriptions and donations   | 765     |
|   |         | (including clothing clubs) .. |         |
|   |         | Annuities .. .. .             | 113     |
|   |         | Management .. .. .            | 588     |
|   |         | Abatements .. .. .            | 1,347   |
|   |         |                               |         |
|   | £21,063 |                               | £13,894 |
|   | Q 2     |                               | Thus    |

Thus we see that, out of an average income for three years of 21,063*l.*, there have been 13,894*l.* spent on the maintenance of the property from which the income is derived. The only item which is at all a personal one is that of gardens and pleasure-ground, which in former years was upwards of 1200*l.* per annum. Out of an income of 21,000*l.*, only about 7000*l.* is obtained. Nothing is included for repairs of the mansion, preservation of game and deer, and various other matters, which add to the pleasure of the public, and which after being met leave a very slender margin for housekeeping, personal expenses, and the education and maintenance of a family. Yet the possessor of a landed income of upwards of 20,000*l.* per annum, free of mortgages or encumbrances, would by most people be considered a very rich man, and would probably be censured, if he did not keep his estate up in a proper and efficient manner, and contribute largely to all schools and local and other charities.

The owner of the estate above alluded to has been in possession of it about twenty years; during that time he has expended 51,657*l.* on new works, including the re-building of eight farm-houses, the enlargement and substantial repair of fifteen other farm-houses, and the providing in many cases of new buildings for the better accommodation of cattle. It also includes the building of thirty-six cottages, costing on an average 198*l.* a-piece. A great number of new pig-styes and buildings, &c., have been constructed for smaller farmers and the labouring poor. We should point out, that the sum above mentioned is irrespective of an average of from 1500*l.* to 2000*l.* a year in repairs to existing farm-houses, buildings, cottages, &c., but is solely in respect of new work. 8646*l.* has been spent on drainage, and a large number of acres have been laid down in pasture and fenced, at the landlord's expense, during the same period. The whole of this expenditure has been made out of income at great personal sacrifice to the owner and his family.

Another estate containing about 15,000 acres, with a rental of about 25,000*l.* a year, has, during the last fifty years, had upwards of 250,000*l.* spent on new farm-houses, cottages, schools, and draining, in addition to which the owner has rebuilt the family mansion, which was burnt down, at a cost of upwards of 150,000*l.* The whole of this expenditure has been made out of income. The amount of this income is the maximum sum received. It has been subject to many abatements at various times, and is so now. At the time of the rinderpest, which made such fearful havoc amongst our cattle some years back, this landlord sacrificed 17,000*l.* in one year out of his income in order to help the tenants to bear their losses.

We



We give two striking instances of outlay, taken from Mr. Pell's article :—

'The Connington estate, the property of J. M. Heathcote, Esq., in Huntingdonshire, is situated on the borders of the higher lands of the Oxford clay formation, where it descends and merges into the alluvium of the fen-lands of Whittlesea and Holme. Part, therefore, is heavy clay, the poorer portion of which is or was woodland, and store grass-land. The other part is light fen-land, "blowing" in the dry March winds, and of a loose texture. Situated between the two is a considerable amount of mixed soil of good quality, growing good timber, and carrying heavy sheep, and excellent pasture for milk and store cattle. For eighty-seven years the proprietors, a father and son, have resided on the estate, bestowing on it all the personal care and outlay which a love of country life and a sense of duty would prompt. Without yielding to "fads" and whims, all that modern science and practice in agriculture sanctioned has been respected and made use of here. Nothing seems to have been carried out on the one hand in a mean and niggardly fashion, while on the other there is no evidence of extravagance or indifference to economy.

'The gross rental, inclusive of that from small holdings and cottages, has been as follows since the beginning of the century :—

|                         | £     |                         | £      |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--------|
| In the year 1800 it was | 3,603 | In the year 1850 it was | 7,004  |
| " 1810 "                | 6,908 | " 1860 "                | 9,592  |
| " 1820 "                | 7,840 | " 1870 "                | 10,376 |
| " 1830 "                | 6,706 | " 1880 "                | 7,185  |
| " 1840 "                | 6,449 | " 1886 "                | 7,130  |

'But it must be remarked that the rental of 1886 is not all actually received from a tenantry, but is the sum given on the basis of a valuation, a large portion of the estate being in the hands of and cultivated by the owner.

'The expenditure on the enclosure of one parish, the purchase of land, drainage, building, and repairs, or renewals, comes to no less than 143,798*l.*, as below :—

|  | £               |
|--|-----------------|
| Farm premises, cost and repairs .. ..    | 41,311          |
| Cottage repairs between 1860 and 1885 .. | 4,564           |
| Public drainage of fen, say .. ..        | 3,000*          |
| Internal drainage of fen .. ..           | 11,213          |
| Highland drainage .. ..                  | 31,920          |
| Road made .. ..                          | 2,190           |
| Purchase of land .. ..                   | 44,089          |
| Enclosure of one parish .. ..            | 5,511           |
| <b>Total .. ..</b>                       | <b>£143,798</b> |

\* Raised by an annual tax, averaging 11*l.* per annum, and extending over eighteen years.



|                       |       |    | £      | s. | d. |
|-----------------------|-------|----|--------|----|----|
| Brought forward       | ..    | .. | 14,913 | 18 | 6  |
| Buildings and repairs | 8,836 | 4  | 6½     |    |    |
| Gates and fences ..   | 401   | 1  | 5½     |    |    |
| Under-draining ..     | 1,192 | 14 | 7      |    |    |
| Law charges ..        | 146   | 7  | 3      |    |    |
| Management ..         | 1,303 | 17 | 10     |    |    |
| Sundry disbursements  | 81    | 2  | 9      |    |    |
|                       |       |    | 11,961 | 8  | 5  |

Total, say .. .. 26,875 0 0

Net profit, say .. .. 25,410 0 0

‘The average cost from the year 1852 to the year 1883 has been annually:—

|                           |    |    |       |    |   |
|---------------------------|----|----|-------|----|---|
| For buildings and repairs | .. | .. | 8,083 | 6  | 0 |
| Gates and fences ..       | .. | .. | 332   | 11 | 8 |
| Under-draining ..         | .. | .. | 760   | 4  | 5 |

Total .. .. £9,176 2 1

‘The amount annually expended in buildings and repairs alone from Michaelmas 1815 to April 1868, a period of fifty-two years, was 8371*l.* 18*s.* 3*d.*

‘Here we have an instance of an expenditure during one hundred and seven years of over one million sterling on one estate, in the purchase of land and in work and payments necessary to insure this rental of 52,285*l.* Applying the same rule as in the Connington case, and taking the interest of half this amount at 4 per cent. during the whole period, the proprietor from this source alone would have derived an annual income of 20,000*l.*, only 5,410*l.* less than the net income of the improved and enlarged estate at the present time; or if the owners had only hoarded the sums annually spent on the maintenance of their estate during the period under consideration, and had, in the year 1883, brought the accumulation into beneficial use by investing it at the rate of 3½ per cent., the possessor would be in the enjoyment of an income of 36,000*l.* a year. The estate, less the amount purchased, would also be his, not indeed in the high condition which now distinguishes it, but still we may conjecture productive of some, though a considerably less, rental.’

When we compare the expenditure of incomes such as these with the income derived from a large trust fund invested in consols or stocks and shares, both of which incomes, so far as they are liable to income-tax, are regarded by the Legislature as net incomes, we find that, whereas the possessor of the land income does not receive more than about 50 per cent. on the gross revenue as net income, the owner of the other, after paying the tax, has the balance available to be spent as best pleases him. It may of course be urged, that land carries

carries with it many pleasures, that it is something to be seen, touched, walked or ridden over, that there is a satisfaction in possessing it, which has in former times amounted almost to a passion, and which even now is recognized. Now the owner of the funded income, if he wants to enjoy a country estate, has to hire a mansion and the right of sporting over the surrounding lands; and even then he only enjoys it in a modified form. Granting all this, it must not be forgotten that, although landed property has its pleasures, it also has its duties and troubles. Landlords' difficulties have increased enormously during the last few years; it is no longer possible to slide along the old easy groove. The growth of public opinion in rural districts is a fact that cannot be overlooked, and is every day pressing the landlord closer and closer. He has to deal with his tenant-farmers continually, although in the main the latter are loyal to him, the constant and increasing depression is ever encircling round him and them, and causing a constant struggle of demand on one side and concession on the other. There are also some tenant-farmers who are ceaselessly agitating, and who, although they are against minute sub-divisions of land, are anxious to see the old yeoman class re-established, and farmers owning their own lands in blocks of three or four hundred acres. They wish, in fact, to step into the landlords' shoes.

The working of the Education Act is another difficulty which presses hard upon the landlord. He is urged by the clergy and by his own tenants to avoid, at any sacrifice to himself, the formation of a School Board. He has to give the land where new schools are required, and to subscribe heavily towards their maintenance; and even then he is not unfrequently told that he ought to defray the whole of the annual expenditure, and so save the farmers their voluntary rate and the labourers their weekly pence. His attention is continually being called by the Rural Sanitary Authorities to numberless things which have existed from time immemorial—overcrowded cottages, the supply of water, disposal of sewage, infectious-diseases hospitals, and the like. The overcrowded village churchyards often threaten to become a ground for the most bitter controversy, although the landlord is mostly willing to settle the difficulty by giving the necessary land. Then comes the labour difficulty, which is the one above all others that adds fuel to the fire of landlords' troubles. The labourer has now a voice in the management of the country—he is able to make himself heard in the councils of the State. He knows little of what is really going on, and is ignorant of the justice or injustice  
of

of the most important questions of the day. He therefore falls an easy prey to the social agitator, who makes him promises that can never be kept, and offers him rewards which he will never receive.

The late Mr. Richard Jefferies has pointed all this out, in that lucid and realistic way which so much distinguished his writings:—

‘Probably no man in England is so systematically browbeaten all round as the country gentleman. There are two main divisions—one on each side—ever pressing upon him, and besides these, there are other forces at work. A village, in fact, at the present day, is often a perfect battle-ground of struggling parties. When the smouldering labour difficulty comes to a point in any particular district, the representatives of the labourers lose no time in illustrating the cottager’s case by contrasting it with the landlord’s position. He owns so many thousand acres, producing an income of so many thousand pounds. Hodge, who has just received notice of a reduction of a shilling per week, survives on bacon and cabbage. Most mansions have a small home-farm attached, where, of course, some few men are employed in the direct service of the landlord. This home-farm becomes the bone of contention. Here, they say, is a man with many thousands a year, who, in the midst of bitter wintry weather, has struck a shilling a week off the wages of his poor labourers. But the fact is, that the landlord’s representative—his steward—has been forced to this step by the action and opinion of the tenant-farmers. The argument is very cogent and clear. They say: “We pay a rent which is almost as much as the land will bear, we suffer by foreign competition, bad seasons and so on, the market is falling, and we are compelled to reduce our labour expenditure. But then our workmen say that at the home-farm the wages paid are a shilling or two higher, and therefore they will not accept a reduction. Now you must reduce your wages, or your tenants must suffer.” It is like a tradesman, with a large independent income, giving his workmen high wages out of that independent income, whilst other tradesmen, who have only their business to rely on, are compelled by this example to pay more than they can afford. This is obviously an unjust and even cruel thing. Consequently, though a landlord may possess an income of many thousands, he cannot, without downright injustice to his tenants, pay his immediate employés more than those tenants find it possible to pay.

‘Such is the simple explanation of what has been described as a piece of terrible tyranny. The very reduction of rent made by the landlord to the tenant is seized as a proof by the labourer that the farmer, having less now to pay, can afford to give him more money. Thus the last move of the labour party has been to urge the tenant-farmer to endeavour to become his own landlord. On the one hand, certain dissatisfied tenants have made use of the labour agitation to bring pressure upon the landlord to reduce rent, and grant this and that

that privilege. They have done their best, and in great part succeeded, in getting up a cry that rent must come down, that the landlord's position must be altered, and so forth. On the other hand, the labour party try to use the dissatisfied tenant as a fulcrum by means of which to bring their lever to bear upon the landlord. Both together, by every possible method, endeavour to enlist popular sympathy against him.

Meanwhile the old order changes among the farmers and the labourers, as well as among the landed aristocracy. The class of farmer that many of us knew a few years ago is rapidly passing away. It is curious to see the quiet and dignified manner in which, compared with his Irish neighbours, he has borne his troubles. He was slow of ideas, and events have been too quick for him; indeed, it is doubtful whether he ever understood properly what has been passing around him. He has never, like the Irish, blamed the landlords for an economic evolution affecting the whole world, and insisted that it was due entirely to their conduct. He has never attempted to complicate, by a political crisis, the agricultural and economic crisis which already weighs so heavy upon the country; on the contrary, he has always done his best. Acknowledging the rights of others, he never dreams of calling his creditors criminals, but quietly accepts his own misfortunes; and, when the final crash comes, he does everything to facilitate an amicable and business-like settlement of his affairs; not unfrequently attending the sale of his farming stock, and helping to load the vans with what was once his own property. To the last he is active, cheerful, and honest; and when he retires to some obscure corner, probably in a neighbourhood strange to him, to earn his own living in the best way he can, he at least feels that, though he may be pitied, he has done nothing of which he need be ashamed.

With the old class of farmer we much fear that the old type of agricultural labourer is also rapidly becoming extinct. What the agriculturist complains of most, at the present time, regarding the labour question is, not so much the wages he has to pay, as that the quality of labour has deteriorated to an extent hardly to be believed. It is not that the men are less physically strong, but that they have lost the interest that they once took in the farm, and in the welfare of their masters. The old feeling—and a very kindly one in many instances it was—is rapidly disappearing, everything is coming to the hard question of *£ s. d.*, the mutual regard disappears, and dislike and mistrust take their place. The old English agricultural labourer, especially in the Southern Counties, was a 'gentleman',

man' in all his feelings and ideas; there never was any class of man who reciprocated more fully any acts of kindness done them. No doubt on many estates, especially on those the owners of which had been marked for generations for their urbanity and gentleness, and who would always have spoken to a labourer with as much kindness and feeling as they would to one of their own order, this appreciation of being gently dealt with, and the consideration for the feelings of others which it gave rise to, was the result of the surroundings in which he lived. We have known more truthfulness, simplicity of character, combined with shrewdness, tact, and good sense, in an agricultural labourer who could neither read nor write, and had no further education than what he taught himself from an observance of nature and mankind, than in many who had great advantages from education and position. We have known, also, friendships between peer and peasant that have been as sincere, as warm, and as lasting as they could be between those of their own respective class and standing.

But the old type is passing away; it will soon no longer exist. There exists in its stead a class—not that they are all so—but there exists a class, although they are not of ill-repute, do not drink, or swear, and are honest so far as the world is concerned, whose moral sense seems extinct. The days pass by, they earn and receive their money, eat, drink, sleep, and that is all.

'There used,' says Mr. Jefferies, 'to be a certain tacit agreement among all men that those who possessed capital, rank, or reputation should be treated with courtesy. That courtesy did not simply mean that the landowner, the capitalist, or the minister of religion was necessarily in himself superior; but it did imply that those who administered property really represented the general order in which all were interested. So in a court of justice, all who enter remove their hats, not out of servile adulation of the person in authority, but from respect for the majesty of the law, which it is every individual's interest to uphold. But now, metaphorically speaking, the labourer removes his hat for no man. Whether in the case of a manufacturer or of a tenant of a thousand-acre farm, the thing is the same. The cottager can scarcely nod his employer a common greeting in the morning. Courtesy is no longer practised. The idea in the man's mind appears to be to express contempt for his employer's property. It is an unpleasant symptom.' 'In time the cottager may see that property and authority are not always entirely selfish—that they may do good, and be worthy, at all events, of courteous acknowledgment.'

We are living in an age that is becoming every day more and more democratic. All owners of capital are coming in for a good share of abuse: many statesmen, holding high positions,



positions, do not hesitate to look askance at them. Land is the one form of property that is tangible and visible; it is a form of wealth apparent to all eyes, especially to the eyes of those who are discontented, dissatisfied with their lot, and who wish to see it bettered at some other person's expense. No doubt there are many whose sound common-sense prevents them listening to the rather enchanting cry of 'every man his own landlord.' But the majority of mankind are poor and wish to be rich, and if they have hopes held out to them, not only by ordinary political agitators, but by men holding high positions as statesmen, that by ceaseless agitation, combinations, and defiance of law and order, they can attain this end without any labour or trouble to themselves, except such as are involved in carrying out the above recommendations, it is not to be wondered that they eagerly embrace the proposals.

Landlords have a great fact to learn, one which is of the highest importance to themselves: it is that they are a very small minority in the face of a vast majority—a majority that are led to believe, in many instances, by their leaders, that landlords are a race that ought to be exterminated. We have only to turn to Ireland to see that agitation, combination, and defiance of law and order, are followed by practical results, which mean the ruin of one class for the benefit of another.

There is nothing standing between the landlords, who are in a minority, and the other class who form the majority, except the police, the army, and the general love of fair-play which we believe is implanted in the hearts of all Englishmen, but which, we regret to say, it is the aim and object of many political agitators to smother as much as they can. We believe that many thousands of Englishmen, who now have bitter feelings against landlords, hold those feelings merely because they are not acquainted practically with the subject, and take their views entirely from the demagogues that preach to them.

It is, however, of importance to the country and of pressing importance to the landlords, if they wish to be secure from confiscation and pillage in the future, that the landowning class should be increased. Nothing tends more to keep a country together and free it from revolutionary and socialistic bands, than the fact of a large number of freeholders in the community. It is what has saved France again and again; and we believe it will save England if not neglected too long. The Conservative power of the soil has always kept the French Extreme Left in order. It does not matter how small the holding is. The French peasant who owns  $2\frac{1}{2}$  acres of land, who works 13 hours a day and hardly ever tastes meat, will always vote for the *de facto* Government,

Government, while the better-fed, better-housed, better-educated, and better-clothed workmen in Paris will always vote for upsetting it. Whatever may be said about peasant proprietorship, the great fact remains, that it is the one force which opposes most strongly the doctrine of plunder and confiscation ; and it is for this reason, if for this reason alone, that we consider that it behoves every landlord to give every facility for the establishment of small freeholds. Already there are indications that something of the sort is going on.

Companies are being formed which profess to act as intermediaries between seller and buyer, it being obvious that many of the would-be freeholders are not in a position to buy out and out from the landlord, and can only acquire freeholds by paying by instalments. That the system will assume larger proportions before long we feel confident, and unless the march of revolutionary power is too strong for us, it will be attended with success.

We, however, quite admit, that there are very considerable difficulties in the way. There is the fact, that the majority of English and Scotch estates have been laid out in medium and large-sized farms ; that, as we have pointed out, immense sums have been expended to make these what they are ; and that to parcel these out into small farms would not only involve the sacrifice of the existing expenditure, but a renewed outlay of capital on a large scale. In some districts, no doubt, the experiment would be so costly that it would be prohibitive ; but there are others which naturally lend themselves to it, and it is in these that we should like to see the system of small freeholds extended as far as possible. During the depression of the last ten years the estates that have suffered the least have been those on which small holdings existed ; while it appears to have been the invariable rule, that the larger the holdings have been, the more severe has been the distress. This may be partly accounted for by the fact, that in the great majority of instances the large farms have been arable ones, and the small ones pasture. But even with the latter class of farm, the smaller holders have been better able to weather the storm than the larger.

The unremunerative price of corn, and the consequent laying down of arable in pasture, have very much contracted the labour market. This very fact ought to lend an additional stimulus to the movement, as many labourers who now find themselves destitute of employment would, if they had the opportunity of acquiring small freeholds, gladly avail themselves of any scheme that would enable them to do so.

Meanwhile the agricultural interest, as it at present exists,  
has

has to face immense difficulties. What is in the future no one knows. How it will all end no one dares to guess. That it is a question of vital and national importance no one with common-sense will deny. There is a 'Health of Nations' as well as a 'wealth': who shall say that the former is not as important as the latter? The decrease of the rural population, from whom we have always drawn fresh blood and vigorous constitutions to replace the wear and tear of the cities, cannot be viewed without alarm and apprehension.

Are our country districts to become depopulated, our villages and hamlets, on which we have so justly prided ourselves, deserted? Are our country towns to become decayed and neglected, and their tradesmen and professional men, who are dependent on the neighbouring district, practically ruined? Are our labourers to leave their homes to swell the great mass of the unemployed in our great cities, and there lead a life compared with which the hardest moments of their present lives would be as paradise on earth? Is the farmer to gather up what he can out of the wrecks of what used to be a moderate fortune, and leave the home in which he was born, and the country of which he used to be proud, for some distant land in which he can find interest for his money, remuneration for his labour, or at all events fair-play? And lastly, will the landowner himself be obliged to leave the home of his fathers—a home which may have been endeared to him by a thousand memories, which has historical associations and incidents preserved through a long line of ancestors? Are all the noble mansions and their beautiful surroundings, of which we are as a nation so justly proud, to fall into disuse and become no more? Are our manly field-sports, which have done so much to give our people the fine constitutions and powers of endurance they possess, and make them manly, courageous, and self-reliant, to pass away?

If England loses these things, she loses much that makes her England, and makes us ready to love her, cherish her, and protect her. It is the rural life of England, quite as much as her commerce and mighty cities, that have been at once the wonder and the envy of all nations. How often do we hear foreigners say to us, 'We have much finer things than your towns, but we have nothing like your country life: it is as unique as it is delightful, and as delightful as it is unique.'

Nor do we believe, though some noisy demagogues would have us so believe, that the majority of Englishmen in their hearts wish to see the abolition of our country-seats and parks, our villages and hamlets, and our rural population. Englishmen may wish to see the rural population move on with the times;

times; and, if events call for changes which are for the good of the community, they may desire to see them undertaken. They may look to those who are placed in high positions and have large properties to administer, to act up to their position and duties, and to set an example to all around them; but they never wish that the delights and charms of English rural life should disappear and be no more.

There may be a time coming when landed property may be better understood, when it will be seen that landlords are not what they are now often represented to be, but that, on the contrary, they are as a rule a highly-educated, enlightened, and humane set of men; that in most cases they are honest, conscientious, anxious to do their duty, and kind to all around them; that their incomes in the main are derived from capital expended on the soil by themselves or their predecessors, for which they ask only a moderate rate of interest in the shape of rent; that the bulk of these incomes is not spent upon themselves, but upon the homes and appliances of their tenants and dependents, and in other things pertaining to their welfare; and that there is nothing they have so much at heart as to see those about them happy, cheerful, and contented.

---

ART. X.—1. *Speeches during the Recess in England and Ireland.*

2. *Trials in Ireland under the Crimes Act of 1887.*

3. *Standing Orders of the House of Commons.*

NO one who has attentively watched the course of public opinion during the last three months can doubt, that the Government now occupies a much stronger position in the country than it held at the close of last Session. At that time, there was a general feeling of weariness abroad, and assuredly it weighed not less heavily upon Her Majesty's Ministers and members of the House of Commons than upon other classes of the community. A Government is never exhibited to particular advantage during the passage of a Crimes Bill. It is perpetually forced to act upon the defensive, its operations are necessarily slow, its opponents are easily able to excite popular prejudices against it. Moreover, the Ministry last Session, through no fault whatever of its own, suffered somewhat in public estimation by the very devices of its enemies to cripple it—by the scandalous scenes which took place in the House, by the abuse of all forms of debate, and by the monstrous waste of time which made itself conspicuous to the nation day after day. The 'man in the street' does not always discriminate very closely; he perceives the existence of a great evil, and casts the blame for its continuance upon the authorities. Over and over again, a sentiment something like the following was expressed, even by the staunchest friends of the Ministry: 'We elected you to put down lawlessness, whether in the House of Commons or out of it. If you cannot do it, make room for somebody who can.' It was forgotten that such a work takes time, especially when a large portion of the Liberal party has combined with eighty-six disloyal Irish members to thrust every kind of impediment in the way.

The enemies of the Government—we might almost say of the country—looked forward with great hope and confidence to the recess. Their speakers were to go from one end of the land to the other, advocating separation under the innocent guise of 'Home Rule.' The scheme itself was left undefined. Radical speakers and writers very naturally prefer a 'platform' which is elastic and vague. It leaves more play to the imagination, and relieves them from the irksome limitations which are imposed by a strict regard for facts. 'Home Rule,' like an American lightning conductor, may easily be fitted to any house or any locality. Much was expected from its advocacy by Irish members in England. It was also believed that,  
when

when the Crimes Bill came into actual working, there would be a great cry of indignation; and everybody would see the justice of the famous, though not very creditable, boast of Sir George Trevelyan,—‘the man who tumbles down from sheer inability to keep on his feet \*—’ that ‘the game of law and order in Ireland was up.’ Everywhere it was loudly and confidently predicted that before Christmas, either the National League or the Government would inevitably ‘go under.’ And there was a certain degree of truth in the prediction. Something has indeed gone under, but very obviously it is not the Government.

Not only has the Ministry increased its hold upon public confidence, but its supporters have been drawn into closer bonds of union. We are not aware of a single case in which a Conservative constituency, or any section of it, has disapproved of the action of its member in heartily supporting the Government. Considering the immense efforts made by the Radicals to ‘capture’ public meetings, and to stimulate local opposition, this result is highly worthy of consideration. Never, perhaps, have the Radicals been more unscrupulous and malignant in their attacks upon Conservative members of Parliament. All the resources of misrepresentation and of deliberate unfairness have been exhausted. And yet the fact remains, that resolutions of unabated confidence in the Government, and in the sitting member, have been passed unanimously, or with only a ludicrous handful of dissentients, at every Conservative meeting throughout the country. Nothing could more conclusively prove, that the general policy of the Government is thoroughly and warmly supported by the whole body of the Conservative party.

The Liberal Unionists have also steadily gained ground, as those who are brought into direct contact with the people, and have to do with the working of electioneering machinery, are well aware. Occasionally we hear of a secession from the ranks, but it is of no greater significance, as regards its influence upon other minds, than a certain solitary and capricious secession from the ranks of the Conservatives. On the other side, we have to place a large and increasing number of life-long Liberals, who have quietly gone out of the Gladstonian camp, and no longer take a part in Gladstonian politics. They will never vote again for a Gladstonian candidate. The more they have looked at the Home Rule deception, and turned it over, and examined it, the less they have liked it. Active politicians are unanimous in bearing witness to the great and continuous

---

\* Lord Salisbury's description of him at Derby, December 19, 1887.  
Vol. 166.—No. 331.

growth of this class. The Liberal-Unionist organization is still seriously defective, and those who desire to join it are often obliged to grope their way to it in the dark. But the cause itself prospers. The leaders have done, and are constantly doing, their utmost to strengthen and extend it. Opinions differ as to whether they would not be acting more wisely in coalescing frankly with the Ministry, than in simply assisting it from the outside. It is a point of great delicacy and difficulty, and Lord Hartington and his friends are more competent to deal with it than anyone else can possibly be. They have reflected upon all the circumstances, and if they have resolved to preserve their present attitude, we shall be right in assuming that they have the best and the strongest reasons for their decision. No one in the country enjoys the respect and confidence of the country in a higher degree than the Marquis of Hartington, and no one has won that respect and confidence by more upright and honourable means. His course has always been absolutely free from the craft and trickery which too often disfigure party politics. We may now regret that he so long felt it to be his duty to give the great weight of his character and influence to the Gladstonian principles of government. Undoubtedly he imparted an air of reasonableness and safety to those principles; he induced many to adopt them who, but for him, would have suspected danger. But the true consequences of following Mr. Gladstone through all his evolutions have only very recently become apparent to many minds. Lord Hartington is himself eminently loyal and straightforward; he may have had his doubts as to the final goal of Mr. Gladstone's methods, but he probably kept on hoping for the best. If the wrench of parting had to come, there is no man who would not have desired to put it off as long as possible. It is quite evident now that Mr. Gladstone himself did not see or know whither he was going. The end he has pursued has driven him on with fatal velocity from one point to another. His reflection on his own party in 1885, that 'it could not be trusted' to deal properly with a great question, if a majority tempted it aside, was probably suggested by a transient insight into his own character. It must at any rate be admitted that, when the truth became clear to Lord Hartington, he did not hesitate to take the step which honour and patriotism alike indicated, and that he has never for a single moment swerved from it.

When reviewing all the circumstances which affect the position of the Government, the important aid rendered to it by its assailants must not be overlooked. The weapons which they



they took up against it have cut deeply into their own hands. Deliberate and systematic attempts were made to excite disturbances, to break down the authority of the law and the police, and to bring about a condition of society which would have been scarcely one remove from anarchy. There could not have been a greater blunder on the part of our opponents, for nothing is more deeply rooted in our race, wherever it may be found, than the principle of order, and the respect for law. If a law is bad, let it be repealed, but all must obey the law. The industrious classes hold by this doctrine quite as tenaciously as any other class, for they know they would have nothing to gain, and everything to lose, from the terrorism of mobs and the collapse of the legitimate defences of society. In February, 1886, the people of London were given a sort of 'object-lesson' in rioting. By an unfortunate accident, the police were caught off their guard, and a mass of ruffians went through some miles of streets destroying or plundering everything which their hands could reach. The loss inflicted upon tradesmen and others was not confined to the operations of that particular day. For more than a week afterwards, shops were barricaded or closed, people were afraid to go about, and business of all descriptions was very seriously interrupted. The total loss inflicted upon trade must have reached tens of thousands of pounds. Meetings of precisely the same character, as those which caused all this mischief, were again organized for the autumn and winter. The police took precautions to prevent a repetition of the disaster of 1886. For thus discharging an imperative and elementary duty, they were assailed as 'ruffians' and 'murderers,' and more than one member of Parliament, we regret to say, joined in the attack upon them. We fear that Mr. Gladstone cannot be relieved from all responsibility for the excesses of his supporters. When the Irish police were attacked at Mitchelstown, and were 'forced,' as the Nationalist papers boasted, 'to fly for their lives,' and when they fired in self-defence, Mr. Gladstone took great pains to raise the hue and cry against them. He gave out 'Remember Mitchelstown' as a new watch-word. He suggested that Head Constable Whelehan, who was barbarously murdered while trying to save the life of a boycotted man, doomed to death, had only himself to thank for his fate. Whelehan and his comrades, he hinted, had pursued the same line of conduct for which, some years before, men had been lynched. The police in London sent to the house of a Socialist, who had offered to give them information. It suited this man's purpose afterwards to complain of their application. Mr. Gladstone at once fell upon

the police, without waiting to hear their version of the affair. He told the people that they should show the police the door, and say to them 'Walker.' Such advice as this, coming from such a source, could not fail to produce a deplorable effect. It was not surprising that at some of the riotous meetings in Trafalgar Square, the speakers put forward a claim, that Mr. Gladstone entirely approved of their proceedings. When it was evident that London was within a hair's breadth of a serious riot, and a large force of military had to be brought to the aid of the police, Mr. Gladstone gently advised his followers not to provoke a breach of the peace. But immense mischief had already been done, and the results were to be seen in the metropolis, day after day, and in their most intolerable form on the day of rest. Large crowds assembled in the principal streets, and they were only held in check by incessant exertions on the part of a grievously over-worked and harassed police force.

These shameful scenes, and the evils which followed them, made a great impression upon the public, far beyond the limits of the metropolis. What had happened in London might happen anywhere. If every man is to be at liberty to obey the law or not, as the mood may strike him, and if the police are not to be supported by the public and those in authority, it is very clear that no honest man's property, whether it be small or great, will long be safe. This plain and common-sense view of the matter was taken by the general mass of the people; and the leading Radicals soon found it judicious to refrain from joining in the attempt made in one or two directions, more or less disreputable, to inflame the outlaws and criminals of the community against the guardians of order. It would be impossible to condemn too strongly the attempt, by whomsoever made, to destroy the fear of law in a city which contains so large a number of persons who are hardened professional criminals. Every year, the wealth and the comparatively unprotected state of London draw into its gigantic arms a larger number of the least desirable portions of the floating population. It is impossible for all who come to it to find legitimate employment; a great many have no such intention. Their purpose is, not to work hard themselves, but to live upon those who do. The unemployed, who are anxiously looking for legitimate occupation, rarely succeed. There is not enough for all who seek it. Distress in the agricultural districts causes many thousands to turn their steps towards London, where it is still popularly supposed an honest living is open to every man. The problem of managing the population of the metropolis will some day become one of the

the most serious we have ever had to face. One thing ought to be clear to all who think even for five minutes on the subject; namely, that, if the police are not supported by the people whom they represent, they cannot possibly defend the enormous area over which they are thinly scattered. We may judge of the spirit which animates the persons who get up 'demonstrations' in crowded thoroughfares from the remarks of a man named Sweeney, who was one of the speakers at a meeting held in Rotherhithe, on Sunday, the 1st of January. He told the 'aristocrats,' that the people would soon make London 'too hot' for them. And he seems to have used these words in a literal sense, for he went on to say:—

'If it came to the worst they could work terrible havoc in the city. Why, it was possible at any moment for the West-end to be set on fire in seventy or eighty places, and it would be possible to have a huge conflagration of the warehouses from London Wall to Deptford. They could set them alight at any moment.' ('We will do it,' and cheers.) They could fire every ship in the dockyards, and every ship on the Thames, and it would be possible to produce such a national calamity that would consume the very upper classes of this country, who were the people who stood between the unemployed and the work which was necessary for their existence.'

It is much to be regretted that some incautious utterances of Cardinal Manning, to the effect that 'necessity has no law,' and that 'a starving man has a natural right to his neighbour's bread,' gave Sweeney an excuse for telling the mob that the Cardinal was on their side. The moral drawn by Sweeney is one which should teach a lesson to persons occupying eminent positions:—

'He warned the aristocrats of the West-end to beware if they were kept in the state they were now in any longer, for let them remember what Cardinal Manning had said: "Necessity has no law."' (Great cheering.) . . . 'When the highest dignitaries in the land could tell them there was no law for necessity, that meant that no man should starve in a country like this where the warehouses and store rooms were piled with all the luxuries of the land.'

Fortunately for the great body of the public, a man is at the head of the police force, who understands how to do his duty, and who is not afraid to do it. Sir Charles Warren has been made the object of attack in some quarters from which attack is really a compliment. Men who have been in jail, or men who are 'qualifying' to go there, naturally look upon him as the enemy of 'freedom.' But he has earned the respect and gratitude of every decent man or woman in London. A severe, perhaps an unmerited,

unmerited, penalty fell upon his predecessor for once allowing predatory mobs to get the upper hand. It is evident that Sir Charles Warren is determined not to be sacrificed quite so easily at the pleasure of the roughs of London. It has also been made evident, that the private citizens of London are as ready as ever they were to reinforce the ordinary powers of the law whenever it may be necessary. Thousands of persons were willing to come forward and enrol themselves as special constables, and the number would easily have been raised to half a million if the crisis had continued. Public spirit is still keen and vigorous in the community, and it is not likely to be extinguished by the animosity of Socialists, or by the feeble ridicule of the wild fanatics who act as their spokesmen.

That the Government will shortly meet Parliament absolutely stronger than it left it last Session is thus owing, in a great degree, to the Gladstonian tactics. But it has also fortified itself by administering the law firmly in Ireland, and by the great progress it has made towards suppressing rebellion. Everybody, except the Irish rebels and their English allies, readily admits that Mr. Balfour has performed his difficult task with great courage and skill. The Crimes Act has many defects, but they chiefly tell in favour of the persons who seek to set it at defiance. It was not generally understood, when it was making its way through the House of Commons, that a person who was sentenced under its provisions would be free for some weeks to go about the country repeating his offence. Still, it has undoubtedly been the means of doing much good. The fear of the League rests somewhat less heavily upon the people. Crime is still too frequent, and boycotting, which as Mr. Gladstone most truly said, 'derives its sanction from murder,' has not been crushed. But the terror of the law begins once more to exercise its salutary influence. The miscreants, who go about shooting defenceless men at midnight, or maiming cattle, have been driven into hiding. Even Kerry has had a glimpse of peace. The Killarney Quarter Sessions opened this year without a single case. Bluster and menace had induced a large section of the Irish people to believe, that the National League was the real master of the country. Their obedience to it was extorted by fear. One of the witnesses, who was examined before the Cowper Commission, gave an accurate description of the true state of the case. 'There are two Governments in the country now,' he said, 'the government of the National League and the Queen's Government, and in the South of Ireland I am afraid the government of the National League is considerably the stronger, and numbers of the people, through fear and terror,

are

are obliged to join that and obey its laws who hate it, and would like to see it put a stop to to-morrow.'\* These are the people who are to be relieved from the penalties of a very genuine coercion by the miscalled 'Coercion Bill' of last Session. The worst form of coercion ever known in any country is that which has been put into operation by the National League under the form of boycotting. The Crimes Bill of last Session was designed largely to deliver the people from that yoke, and to a great extent it has been successful.

Moreover, the determination shown by the Government is producing its effect in other directions. Influential prelates have once more been nerved to do their duty. The Bishop of Limerick has denounced both the Plan of Campaign and boycotting, and in return the organ of Fenianism and sedition has sought to make Dr. O'Dwyer a marked man in Ireland. The priesthood long stood out manfully against the Land League and its 'apostolic successor,' but the time came when it seemed as if the League were destined to conquer. The people were driven into it, and the priests followed. Mr. Gladstone gave the League his benediction, and the Archbishops and Bishops could scarcely do less. But there have always been the strongest reasons for believing, that the priests, with a few exceptions, thoroughly distrusted and disliked the League, and were only waiting for the Government to shew some sign of life and power, in order that it might be reasonably prudent on their parts to resist its insolent tyranny. The Clan-na-Gael has more than once been condemned. The 'Athletic' Societies, which are really bodies of armed rebels, received the censure of one of the highest dignitaries of the Church. Independent evidence from many sources points irresistibly to the fact, that the Roman Catholic clergy have been placed under a thralldom which is as hateful to them as it is to the honest classes of tenants. It is too clear that the Roman Church has brought some reproach upon itself by its apparent encouragement of treason in Ireland. That stain may not speedily be effaced, but men like the Bishop of Limerick will save the Church from indelible disgrace. The message which they send to England seems to be, 'Let the Government do its duty, and we will do ours.' We cannot call the condition unreasonable, especially in a country where a wholly abnormal state of society exists, and where a powerful and wealthy organization, assisted by one of the historic English parties, has long been at work to stir up a revolution.

---

\* Evidence of Mr. C. B. Coote, of County Cork.

The improvement which is visible in Ireland is not to be ascribed to any change in the spirit or operations of the League. Its leaders are inflamed by the bitterest enmity to the Government, which seeks to prevent them establishing a hostile nation at the very doors of England. It is true that the members of the League, who are drafted among the English constituencies, modify their tone as they cross the channel. All they ask for is peace, reconciliation, and love. But as soon as they get into regions where they can speak their minds freely, all disguises are thrown off. Mr. Arthur O'Connor, who well represents the craft and subtlety of the League, boasted at New Jersey in October last, that 'in whatever war Great Britain may be involved, whatever Power she may have to struggle with, that Power can count upon 100,000 Irish arms to fight under her flag against Great Britain.' Dr. Tanner, who is an equally capable representative of the violence and brutality of the League, declared in Cork on the 20th of December, that 'Balfour might have touched . . . the point when blood should be spilt,' and that 'it might be wise to offer passive resistance to-day, but bullets might be necessary on the morrow.' Other members of Parliament, who have avowedly and deliberately gone out of their way to defy and break the law, have been sent to prison, but not as Mr. Gladstone sent Mr. Parnell, Mr. Dillon, and ever so many more—without a trial. No man is in jail who has not undergone a perfectly fair trial before two or more magistrates, and if he has been sentenced to more than a month's imprisonment, he has had a right of appeal, and in almost every case has used it. The Gladstonian speakers and writers have pretended to stand aghast at the spectacle of members of Parliament deprived of their liberty, though they found much to admire in the same spectacle, when Irish members were sent to 'British Bastilles' by Mr. Gladstone's 'lettres de cachet.' The simple truth is, that there is no reason whatever why a member of Parliament should not be sent to jail if he is proved to have been a law-breaker. It is not for him to choose which laws he will obey and which he will disregard. Most Irish members, and some of their English colleagues, seem to think that they are too important and too sacred to be profaned by the touch of a policeman. Mr. Conybeare evidently thought so, although he was wary enough not to bring the point to a practical test. Mr. Cunningham Graham, fresh from South America and the River Plate, where law is a variable quantity, decided to make a practical experiment in Trafalgar Square. He did so, and was soon satisfied that the law, in England at any rate, is stronger than Mr. Graham. Of the Irish

Irish members, who avowed their determination to 'put down Balfour and the police,' some ran away, one spent some weeks in being hauled up and down a donjon keep, like a conspirator in Offenbach's comic operas, others went to prison. In Mr. William O'Brien's case, there was an avowed resistance to the law, and nothing could be alleged which even distantly resembled what magistrates and judges are wont to deem extenuating circumstances. Mr O'Brien knew that he was violating the law, and he knew the consequences of his act. He boasted, more than once, that he was pursuing with his eyes open a course, which was certain to bring him into direct conflict with justice. He was tried, found guilty, appealed, and finally was sent to serve his sentence. There is nothing in all this which differs from the processes of law in ordinary circumstances. So far from any exceptional hardships having been inflicted upon Mr. O'Brien, the prison dietary was altered for him on the recommendation of the doctor, and other exceptional privileges seem to have been granted him, although he was not allowed to dictate the fashion and colour of his clothes. In Father Ryan's case also, the law merely took its customary course. The 'Plan of Campaign' is admitted to be illegal, and when Father Ryan called upon his people to put the 'Plan' into operation, he incited them to break the law, and in so doing he broke it himself. No one desires to see priests imprisoned, but they cannot be permitted to trample Acts of Parliament beneath their feet. They stand on the same level, in that respect, as the humblest or the most exalted in the land. Father Ryan knew better than many of his dupes the consequences of a studied defiance of the law. We may regret that he thought proper to bring down the penalties of justice upon his head, but even such of the Parnellites as call themselves lawyers would scarcely contend, that Irish priests are to be free from those restraints and obligations which rest upon all other citizens of the United Kingdom.

The case of Mr. Wilfrid Blunt stands on much the same footing. A meeting had been called in a proclaimed district for the purpose of stirring up the people to resist the law. There had been serious disturbances in the district a few days previously, and the Lord Lieutenant's Proclamation had been publicly burned in the presence of a large multitude—'a proceeding,' remarked the judge who decided the appeal, 'more suggestive and more demoralizing than any language could have been.' Mr. Blunt was warned by the local magistrate that his proposed meeting was illegal; he had himself been present at a midnight meeting of the National League, and stood by consenting, while Mr. O'Brien burnt the Lord Lieutenant's



tenant's Proclamation. The police did their duty in dispersing the unlawful meeting; Mr. Blunt resisted them, and he has to bear the penalty of his offence. A poor man would have been sent to jail, and, as we have often been told, there must not be one law for the rich and another for the poor. Nothing in Mr. Blunt's position entitles him to special sympathy. He went over to Ireland to encourage rebellion, and a much milder punishment has rewarded his efforts than that with which he would visit evil-doers. He looks upon Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour as offenders against the law, and he has suggested that 'capital punishment' would about meet their deserts. 'He should not be sorry,' he told the people of Kidderminster, 'to see a few heads fall on the block.' A gentleman of these exceedingly fierce and bloodthirsty instincts ought not to cry out so loudly at the 'barbarity' of a couple of months' imprisonment.

For the rest, none of the calamities which were foretold from the operation of the Crimes Bill have been witnessed. No innocent man has suffered. Comparatively few public meetings have been in any way interfered with, and no newspaper has been suppressed or had its plant seized. The prisons are not filled with men and women, arrested on mere suspicion, and not allowed to know the charge against them. All these things could and did take place under Mr. Gladstone's Coercion Bills, the most rigorous of which, be it remembered, was conducted through the House of Commons, in a spirit of almost ferocious exultation, by Sir William Harcourt. But the Parnellites were then a 'cancerous sore,' to be 'cut out with a surgeon's knife,' and the operator did not foresee that the victim would one day be his master.

The Government has thus far done well, but probably no one is better aware than Ministers themselves that their work is very far from being concluded. Anarchy has been hurled back, but it is not defeated. It will have to be boldly confronted in every direction, and the very first place, from which it must be driven, is the House of Commons. The evil there has become a great national danger, as well as an intolerable scandal. In plain terms, the Irish rebel party seek to wreck the British Parliament, a considerable number of Radicals aid and abet them, and unless they are quickly overpowered and put to the rout, it will be in vain for the people to expect the House of Commons to attend to their requirements, or to look to it for decorous debate. The most renowned legislative assembly in the world will become the shame of England and the ridicule of the world. The public have, even now, no adequate

quate idea of the degradation which has already been inflicted upon the House, or of the extreme difficulty which is experienced in transacting any real business. At the close of last Session, the members of the Government and the officers of the House were utterly broken down and worn out, and they, as well as the large majority of members, look forward to the possibility of such another Session with dismay. It is idle for anyone to talk of governing Ireland, or India, or any other part of the Queen's dominions, if the House of Commons cannot govern itself. The centre of power being all in chaos, not much good can be looked for elsewhere. Of all the questions demanding the attention of the Government, this is incomparably the most urgent, and it is to be hoped the Session will not be a fortnight old before a reasonably satisfactory settlement has been arrived at.

Statistics as to the number of nights which were utterly lost and thrown away, or of the endless brawls that took place, or of the scenes of abominable disorder which disgraced last Session, tell the people little or nothing. Morning, afternoon, or night, a staff of members was perpetually on duty to insult and defy the Speaker, to break the rules of the House, to paralyse its proceedings, and to crush the spirit and strength of every one engaged in carrying on the business of the nation. Some of the language used could not be printed in any decent publication. The epithets flung across the House by one or two of the Irish members were borrowed from the vilest of the vile. Either the reporters in the Gallery never happen to hear these expressions, or they are not permitted to report them. It is to be regretted, that one or other of the morning papers cannot be induced to give the public all the flowers of debate which adorn an Irish field night. The reports are made decorous before publication, and the consequence is, that the nation is all in the dark as to what goes on within the walls of St. Stephen's. They cannot see the nightly tortures to which the Speaker and Ministers are exposed, nor have they any idea of the sacrifice which regular attendance at the House imposes upon members whose duty it is to support the Government. Sometimes, indeed, through one mischance or another, the Parliamentary reports convey a totally false impression of the proceedings. The Irish members are full of resources. They manage to hoodwink even the most hostile portion of the Press, and compel it to do their work. The trick is simple enough. Business has begun at a quarter past four. A string of frivolous and dreary questions easily disposes of an hour. Then perhaps there is an obstructive motion to adjourn the House. Then at

six or seven o'clock there are the orders of the day, which are at once seized upon by the Parnellites and their allies. Eight o'clock comes, ten o'clock, midnight—still the muddy stream of talk is flowing on. The Conservatives have probably been silent all through the night. At length the impatience of one or two of their number becomes exhausted. A cry of 'oh, oh,' or perhaps a ripple of laughter or an ironical cheer—all strictly Parliamentary—is heard on their benches. Instantly the Irishmen and the Radicals are in a white heat of indignation. The Conservatives are accused of being 'drunk,' of having violently interrupted and terrorized the unoffending Irish members since the opening of the Sitting, of preventing them from opening their mouths. One after another of the party protests in fiery strains against the cruel treatment, the terrible oppression, to which the long-suffering Irish members are continually exposed. They appeal to the Chairman—the House being probably in Committee—for protection. The Chairman, who has perhaps had to check several Irish members during the evening, now by way of keeping the balance even, rebukes the Conservatives. All this is duly reported in the newspapers, and the Conservatives are depicted as an unruly, roystering, tyrannical faction, and the Parnellites as a patient and downtrodden minority. People who have watched all that has gone on are astounded the next morning to see with what dexterity the wolf is made to play the part of the lamb. These devices do not succeed so well when the Speaker is in the Chair, for nothing escapes his vigilance or disturbs his impartiality. But at various times during last Session, the Conservatives were placed before the public in an utterly false and unmerited position, and much bitterness of feeling was excited in consequence. The rank and file of a party seldom get credit for anything. If they have travelled hundreds of miles to be present at a division, or come from a sick bed, or sat up till daylight week after week, their only reward is to read in the newspapers a paragraph to the effect that the '*whips* deserve the greatest credit for the recent successful divisions.' It is felt to be a little hard that, when the private member is accused of offences which he has not committed, there should be no one in authority ready to protest against the injustice.

No alterations of rules can affect this particular part of the tactics of the Parnellites and Gladstonians. They have practised it so long that they have brought it to great perfection. An observer, who cannot be accused of any partiality towards the Tories, has pointed out, that it is a principle with the Irish members to create disorder and then appeal to the Chair for protection.

protection. He has recorded that 'in whatever part of the House the speakers may stand, if they are in any way obnoxious to denizens of the Irish quarter, they are assailed with constant interruptions,'\* and he has described how the Irish members can 'do insult to the courtesies of the House of Commons by the manners of a mob.'† He tells us also that 'though the Land Leaguers habitually bring the most odious charges against all kinds of people from whom they differ, and personally vilify members of the House, if, in a moment of irritation, any one says a few frank words about them, they run whining for the protection of the Speaker, and gratefully waste an hour in complaining.'‡ 'Their avowed object is to make themselves and their country so obnoxious in the eyes and ears of England, that in some moment of despair Parliament may bid them go to College Green, and, presently calling the watch together, thank Heaven they are rid of a knave.' All this is much more true to-day than it was in 1881-82, but the public, who judge of the proceedings in the House of Commons from reports in the newspapers, are not aware, how gross is the behaviour of many of the Irish members, and how exceedingly rare it is that the House, or any section of it, gives them the smallest cause for complaint.

We take it for granted that important, though perhaps not extensive, changes in the Rules of Procedure will be proposed as soon as the House meets. Nothing, of course, can be done till the Debate on the Address is concluded, but not more than a couple of nights ought to be devoted to that. Last Session, four working weeks—seventeen nights—were squandered in wrangling over the Address, and this loss of time was not, and could not possibly be, compensated for by subsequent diligence. The closure as it at present stands affords the means of stopping the Debate, and if two nights were allowed for the 'Address,' it would be one night more than long custom and precedent justifies, or than can be usefully employed. But for the regular work of the House, under the conditions which now exist, the closure as framed last year is too feeble to be of much service. Its great defect is, that it cannot be put into action unless there is a clear majority of two hundred in its favour. Now it is almost impossible to keep so large a majority throughout the Session, and at all hours of the night. There will always be a certain proportion of members who are absent from the House by reason of illness or domestic affliction; others cannot possibly

---

\* 'A Diary of Two Parliaments,' by Mr. H. Lucy, vol. ii. p. 113.

† Ibid. p. 119.

‡ Ibid. p. 258.

endure the immense fatigue of incessant attendance. The heavy burden of the labour therefore falls upon the same men, week after week. The House is now composed of 313 Conservatives, 77 Liberal Unionists, and 280 Parnellites and Gladstonians. The Liberal Unionists are available for critical divisions, and many of them are indefatigable in the discharge of their duties; but as a rule they do not profess to be willing to 'keep a House,' or to remain during the weary hours of obstruction. The consequence is, that in the usual course of affairs, the Parnellites may obstruct as much as they please from seven o'clock till nearly eleven, and probably they may go on all night, the Government only lacking four or five of the needful majority of two hundred. More than once last Session, the Irish party made themselves masters of the House for an entire sitting, because the Conservatives could not bring up one or two more votes. Five-line whips were common, four-line whips were almost the rule. The Tory party responded most heartily to the demands of their chiefs, but they could not possibly give up all their time Session after Session. A remedy was proposed last year by a Liberal Unionist, Mr. Craig-Sellar. He brought forward a resolution, fixing one hundred and twenty as the limit of the majority requisite to call the closure into play. Many Conservatives voted for it, and the Ministry were quite willing that more should do so, though they did not feel able to support it themselves. Unfortunately, the resolution was defeated, and the Conservatives who thoughtlessly voted against it had full time and cause for repentance before the close of the Session.

All schemes based on proportionate majorities are clumsy and unsatisfactory. A bare majority offers a straight road out of the difficulty, but many old members of the House shrink from so great an innovation upon ancient custom, and everybody must sympathize with their objections. What we must consider, however, is that we have no longer a question of expediency or of choice before us. We have to save the House of Commons from destruction by its avowed enemies. We must cripple these enemies, or they will, to use their own words, 'smash the machine.' Ministers who made a tyrannical use of the closure would soon be called sharply to account by the country. The very knowledge, that it could be put into operation by a bare majority, would tend much to diminish the necessity for its employment by discouraging systematic obstruction. The most malicious of the Irish allies would find little pleasure in obstructing business when he knew, that at any moment he could be extinguished. We admit that there is a  
very

very strong feeling in the Tory party against the closure in its most drastic form, and as in all such cases a compromise must be adopted. We believe that, if the present number of the majority were cut down by one-half—that is to say, to one hundred—every reasonable objection would be met. If there should be at any time one hundred and fifty Separatists in the House, it would require two hundred and fifty one Unionists to carry the closure. Surely this affords all the security that the most timid could desire. A fear is sometimes expressed that the Gladstonians would turn the weapon against us whenever—if ever—they return to office. But does anyone suppose that our *not* adopting it would prevent them using it? Will they spare us because we have been scrupulous, even timid, in constructing the weapon? Their eminent leader can always find a plausible reason—an unanswerable reason, as he contends—for anything he wishes to do. If the Conservatives in Opposition imitated the obstructive tactics of the Separatists, or even if they exercised the right of free and fair debate, it would not be long before the closure by a simple majority made its appearance. A scrupulous respect for precedents, a regard for fair play, and minute accuracy on matters of facts, are not the most prominent characteristics of the Radicals. They would declare that the Conservatives had despotically used the closure, even if it had not been set in motion twice in a Session. The duty of the Tory party is to free the machinery of the House of Commons from the encumbrances which have been so dexterously thrown into every part of it. The closure will fall into disuse, the moment public business is permitted to proceed in a reasonable manner.

All who have any experience of the House, or who have followed its proceedings with due attention, will feel that the time has come when the duration of its sittings should be brought within moderate limits. Flesh and blood cannot stand the wear and tear of daily and nightly life in the House under the conditions which now prevail. It is not to the advantage of the nation, that the Ministers of the Crown should have their energy and vitality destroyed by being harassed in Parliament twelve or fourteen hours out of the twenty-four, and by being called upon for at least six hours more of office work. Repeatedly, last session, Mr. W. H. Smith had to sit in the House—with perhaps an interval of one hour only—from four in the afternoon till five or six the next morning. His colleagues, many of whom had to attend to their departmental duties from 10 or 11 o'clock down to the very moment of the meeting of the House, might frequently have been seen trying to  
snatch

snatch a few moments uneasy sleep on the Treasury bench or in the lobbies. The law officers, as a rule, had to be in Court or at consultations at ten o'clock, and sometimes they had not left the House till six the next morning. Everybody connected with the work of Government at present does his work under almost unexampled difficulties. It cannot be too widely known that to stop all business, to weary out the Ministry, to irritate and depress the majority, is now the express object of the Separatists whenever the House meets. Any peg is good enough to hang a discussion upon. A motion to consider the dismissal of a charwoman in a workhouse in Ireland fully answers the purpose. The hare once started, the whole pack may be trusted to spend the night in chase of it. The scheme of operations has become almost mechanical in its simplicity. All the early part of the night is wasted in absurd questions or obstructive motions or amendments. As midnight comes round a brawl is got up, which carries the House on till one or two o'clock. Then a Gladstonian drops in casually, and in a cheerful manner proposes an adjournment, on the ground of the lateness of the hour. The Ministerialists protest; Sir W. Harcourt—who has probably been absent nearly the whole of the night—denounces them as Tory bloodsuckers and pirates. Another of Mr. Parnell's tools then declaims passionately against the monstrous wickedness of attempting to do business after one in the morning. Divisions on motions of adjournment take up another hour or two, and, unless an 'all night' sitting has been resolved upon, the Ministry are obliged to give way. Before twelve it is too early to approach serious business; after twelve it is too late. The Parnellites can do pretty much as they like. It is ludicrous to hear member after member asking them humbly, whether they think any business will be done that night, or how long some sham debate is likely to last? They have advanced very far towards that cherished end which consists, as one of their number has frankly told the public, in making Mr. Parnell the 'lord and master, and dictator of the British Parliament.'\*

It is true—and we cannot quite exclude the fact from this statement—that Mr. Gladstone has assured us all, that he and his followers were not allowed to speak last Session. To quote his own words,† 'We were silenced during the last Session of Parliament.' 'We had no power to open our mouths, except upon the proposals they (the Ministry) made.' He gives us to understand that they could not, and did not, move the adjourn-

\* Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 'Gladstone's House of Commons,' p. 236.

† Speech at Dover, December 27, 1887.



ment of the House, or get up prolonged debates on insignificant questions, or waste any time upon the Estimates. But what we find upon looking into the records of the Session is, that Mr. Gladstone's English and Irish followers delivered 7368 speeches—a pretty good score, considering that they had 'no power to open their mouths.' Each Parnellite in the House, striking an average, spoke 42 times, and each Gladstonian 19. This average, of course, does great injustice to Mr. Conybeare or Dr. Clarke, as well as to the Harringtons and the Healys. The Conservatives, all told, delivered 3590 speeches, chiefly in reply to questions or in defence of Ministerial measures. The private members of the party spoke comparatively little. The Liberal Unionists account for 552 speeches. The Gladstonians and Parnellites were called to order 612 times—a piece of statistics which, even if it stood alone, would serve to show which is the disorderly party in the House. The Ministerialists were called to order 64 times. The nature of the disorderly proceedings cannot, of course, be indicated by mere figures.

Is there any good purpose to be answered by striving any longer to carry on the nation's business in this bungling and impracticable way? In old days, very late sittings were not unknown, but they were uncommon, whereas they are now the rule. Most of the Irish members have no occupation outside the House; some of them are paid for their attendance. Sixty of their number, according to Mr. Bright, 'are paid, and are the open foes of England, sent to Parliament and maintained there by wages paid by American Irish, who would rejoice at war between us and the great English nation on the American continent. I doubt if there be any other representative body in the world who would allow to sit in the House of Parliament, and take part in its deliberations, and vote, fifty or sixty men who have the dollars in their pockets, contributed by men across the Atlantic, whose every action and whose every word is directed against the interests of this country.\*' We give this on Mr. Bright's authority. What is certain is, that only to the Irish members is the House of Commons, in these days, the 'finest club in the world.' To many of them not only is it a club, but almost a home. Considering what comfort it affords them, it is somewhat ungrateful on their parts to do all in their power to destroy it. They go early in the day, and they are disappointed if they are not still there early the next day. The more they obstruct business, and the more prominent they

---

\* Speech at Greenwich, August 5th, 1887.

make themselves in turbulent scenes, the more highly their constituents approve of them. In all these respects they hold English members at a great disadvantage, and the nation at a still greater, for all its important interests are thrust peremptorily and hopelessly aside.

If these abuses are to be corrected, there must be new provisions made for the hours of meeting and of adjournment. Two o'clock might be found too early, but four is certainly too late. The House might fairly be expected to meet at three, and go on, with the brief break of an hour for dinner, till half an hour after midnight. At that time, the question should be put from the Chair as a matter of course, unless the debate were adjourned by general consent. Without this arrangement, the ordinary device, which renders Wednesday almost useless for legislative purposes, would be repeated night after night. Everything would be 'talked out.' This could not happen, if the closure came into automatic operation at half-past twelve every night. Beyond that, half an hour might be allowed for going through the other orders of the day—no opposed business to be taken—and the House should adjourn, under all circumstances, not later than one. Express authority must be vested in the Chair to decline putting a motion for adjournment, when it is obviously frivolous, or when it is wholly beside the business of the day, or involves an issue upon which the House has already voted the same Session. If something of this sort is not done, dilatory motions for adjournment will be brought forward every day in the week, and no real business will be even approached, until it is too late to go on with it. The power given to the Chair must be compulsory, and not merely discretionary in its character. A skilful use of motions for adjournment will otherwise defeat all precautions against obstruction.

It is most unlikely that serious objections would be raised to these proposals, except, perhaps, on the part of notorious and professional obstructionists. No reasonable member of the House, on either side, wishes to perpetuate the present system of unlimited late hours. Almost everybody looks upon it with impatience and dislike. Under the plan above suggested, the House would have at least  $8\frac{1}{2}$  working hours each sitting, four days in the week. No one will dispute that, if this time were well employed, a comparatively short Session would amply suffice for all the *bonâ fide* business which called for attention. If obstruction still went on, and the garrulity of the Separatists was unchecked, everybody would know that at half-past twelve the dreary spell would be broken. After a time, the universal feeling

feeling of the House would be found strong enough to discourage tactics which merely prevented free discussion, without delaying a final decision. The House would become a more business-like body, and the debates would gain in every way by being made much shorter. The country would gain, and Parliament would, to a great extent, be rescued from the ignominious thralldom into which it has lately fallen.

But there is still another reform which must be carried out, if the work is to be thoroughly done. The authority of the Chair must be enlarged and strengthened in dealing with members who break the rules of the House, or who are guilty of the persistent misconduct for which several members have gained a notoriety. More than once last Session the Speaker himself was received with mocking cries of 'Oh, oh,' upon rising to call some turbulent member to order, and the night ought not to be forgotten when cries were raised of 'down with the Speaker,' while Mr. Gladstone put himself at the head of the Parnellites, and walked out of the House amid their yells and shouts. The *Journal*, which specially represents the principle of lawlessness, boasted at the time, 'cries went off like the popping of champagne corks, and the quarter below the gangway was transformed into a perfect Babel. Among the exclamations which reached the Press Gallery were these—"Privilege," "Star Chamber," "Conspiracy," and "Down with the Speaker." The "Order, Order," of the Speaker, who was standing awaiting an opportunity to put the question, was, amid the terrible uproar, of no more avail than would have been the fetish cry of Mumbo Jumbo.' Scenes of this kind naturally delight the Parnellites, their Radical allies, and their organs in the press, but by every decently-conducted man in the country they are regarded with shame and disgust. The attempt to break down the authority of the Speaker has received the tacit approval, if not the open support, of more than one member of Mr. Gladstone's last Administration. This fact makes it all the more necessary, that the House should arm the Speaker with the powers that may be requisite to enable him to perform his most difficult and responsible duties.

We may fairly hope that we are passing through an exceptional phase of Parliamentary life, and that, when the revolutionary spirit has been quelled, respect for law and order will again mark the proceedings of the House of Commons. But we can scarcely expect to see revived that reverence for the ancient rules and observances of the House, which once made it unnecessary for the Speaker to do more than exercise his authority in a purely formal manner. No protection for such

a functionary can be so strong as that which is derived from the general feeling, that any member of the Assembly over which he presides, who treats him with intentional disrespect, commits a disgraceful act. That feeling, for hundreds of years, distinguished the House of Commons. If it cannot for the moment be restored, something more tangible must be substituted in place of it. At present, there is a great danger that the Speaker's office will be systematically degraded, notwithstanding the efforts of the majority of the House to prevent that disaster. What happens now, when a Member has been guilty of improper conduct, too closely resembles a farce. The offender is, perhaps, called to order, and he obeys with a sneer. If he is required to apologize, he does so in a manner which greatly aggravates the original offence. Even if, on the motion of the leader of the House, he is temporarily suspended from service, the period is so short, and the penalty is put into operation with so much difficulty, that no good effect is produced. The House, and even the Speaker, may be insulted without a technical infringement of the Rules, provided a member knows exactly how far those Rules can be stretched—and the Parnellites are proficient in the art. Not to go further back than last Session, we find that one of these members declared he would prefer to have Mr. Biggar in the Chair, but that Mr. Peel made 'an excellent substitute.' Upon the Speaker calling him to order, the member said he did not want to institute an invidious comparison between Mr. Peel and Mr. Biggar. Mr. Conybeare, at a public meeting, accused the Speaker of having ceased to be impartial, and of 'allying himself with the most tyrannical party in the House.' The matter was brought before the House, not very judiciously, by Mr. Chaplin; and when the Speaker assured the House that it was his earnest desire to allay party feeling rather than to increase it, several of the Irish members burst into insulting laughter. Mr. Conybeare made a mock explanation, to the great delight of his Irish comrades, and the honours of the contest—such as they were—remained with him. Another member called one of the Ministry an 'ex-convict.' Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, whom the Parnellites now affect to love and honour, was accused—of course unjustly—of having threatened to 'murder' the people of Ireland, and he was denounced in the bitterest language for hours. The Irish Secretary had explained at the beginning of the evening that he was suffering from ill-health, which was doubtless one reason why he was turned out to be hunted. All who remember that night's work will appreciate the comparison drawn by the very same Irish members between the

the

the 'mild, humane, and courteous Sir Michael Hicks-Beach' and the 'tyrant' and 'murderer' who now fills his office.

One evening, the Conservatives were called 'a d—d pack of assassins,' but the compliment did not appear to reach the ears of the Chairman of Committees. A member was called 'a liar' in full House, and, although the offender was suspended, he came back a few days after amid the triumphant shouts of his friends. Here is a very fair example of the sort of 'apology' which is now thought quite sufficient to appease the outraged dignity of the House. We quote from the 'Times' report of May 25th (1887) :—

'Sir T. LAWRENCE, speaking from his seat, said that the hon. member for Mid Cork had just applied the expression "damned curs" to hon. members.

'The CHAIRMAN.—The hon. member must withdraw that expression, or notice must be taken of it.

'Dr. TANNER said that, as usual, he had been misquoted. The words he had applied to the whole of the members on those benches were "damned cowards" (laughter), and he would apply them again only for the Chairman. In deference to the ruling of the Chairman, he would withdraw the words. (Laughter.)

Any one desirous of finding models of apologies *à la mode* need only read the 'Times' reports. Take another specimen from the same paper :—

'In reference to some remark from Mr. G. Balfour,

'Dr. TANNER called out, "Swallow it."

'The CHAIRMAN.—I myself heard the hon. member for Mid Cork make use of an offensive observation, and I must call upon him to withdraw it. (Hear, hear.)

'Dr. TANNER, sitting in his place, raised his hat and said, "Certainly."

'The CHAIRMAN.—Order, order. I must call upon the hon. member to withdraw.

'Dr. TANNER, rising.—Certainly, Sir, if you wish it.

'Mr. W. H. SMITH.—I rise to order, Sir. I wish to call your attention to the fact that the manner in which the hon. member has withdrawn will not conduce to the dignity of the House. (Cheers.)

'The CHAIRMAN.—Does the hon. member withdraw the expression?

'Dr. TANNER.—Certainly, Sir. I thought I had expressed myself clearly to that effect already.

'The CHAIRMAN.—I wish the hon. member for Mid Cork to understand that he must not only withdraw the expression, but that he must apologise for having made it. (Hear, hear.)

'Dr. TANNER.—Certainly, Sir.'

Such 'fun' as this is easily kept up by the Anglo-Parnellites hour after hour. Apologizing to the House, especially when  
in

in Committee, has come to be regarded as one of the favourite sports of the evening. It frequently diversifies the monotony of an all-night sitting—as, for instance, on the 22nd-23rd March, 1887 :—

‘Mr. Noble.—I rise to order, Sir. (“Oh, oh.”) I wish to ask you whether the hon. member for Mid Cork is in order in using the words “He is drunk” to an hon. member on this side of the House. (Cries of “Order,” and interruption.)

‘The CHAIRMAN.—I did not hear the words if they were used. (Home Rule cheers.)

‘Captain COTTON.—I beg to say that I heard the hon. member for Mid Cork use those words. (“Order,” and interruption.)

‘The CHAIRMAN.—The words did not reach this end of the House. (Loud cries of “Name” and “Order.”)

‘Captain COTTON.—I heard the hon. member say that some hon. member on this side of the House was drunk. (Home Rule cries of “What did he say?” and “Who?”)

‘The CHAIRMAN.—Order, order; if such an observation was made by the hon. member for Mid Cork it is most offensive and must be withdrawn. (Cheers.)

‘Dr. TANNER.—Mr. Courtney—(loud cries of “Order” and “Withdraw”)—I am not going to withdraw. If the hon. member will point out any hon. member to whom I used the expression, I, of course, will withdraw it. (“Oh, oh.”)

‘The CHAIRMAN.—The expression is most offensive and disorderly to be used of any hon. member. (Cheers.) I now call on the hon. member to withdraw the expression. (Cheers and loud cries of “Withdraw.”)

‘Dr. TANNER.—Out of respect to you, Mr. Courtney, I should withdraw anything you tell me to withdraw. (Laughter.)’

To find the apology in this report is like searching for the hidden puzzle in one of Mr. Furniss’s pictures. It is only fair to the hero of the scenes described above to admit, that he is not more active in promoting brawls than several of his colleagues.

We have cited a few illustrations of the evil which has to be dealt with. Scores of others might be given, for it is scarcely too much to say, that not a week passes—sometimes not a night in a week—without an incident of the same kind. The lawless party rely mainly on the expectation, that the public outside will never know what has taken place. But wherever a member has taken the trouble to explain the truth to his constituents, it has excited more indignation than any number of reported outrages in Ireland. This proves that the people generally would not tolerate anarchy in the House of Commons if they could prevent it, and it is therefore very clearly the duty of their

their representatives to prevent it. It is not our business to specify the particular remedy which should be adopted. Probably it will be found necessary to arm the Speaker or Chairman with express instructions—not merely with a discretionary power—to suspend a disorderly member without calling for a vote of the House. An apology, if admitted, should be unequivocal in form, and made, not from a member's place, but from the Bar of the House, accompanied with a distinct pledge that the offence shall not be repeated. Continued breaches of the rules should be visited with disqualification to sit in the House for at least one month, or, in some cases, for the remainder of the Session. If a constituency has acted in the spirit of the well-known threat ascribed to Grattan—'You have destroyed our Parliament, but we will send into the heart of yours a hundred of the greatest scoundrels in the Kingdom'—it can have no valid reason for complaint when it finds itself disfranchised for a Session, or even for the lifetime of a Parliament.

The first step towards doing anything of the least value must therefore be to place the nation once more in possession of the House of Commons. The next step will doubtless be a determined effort to put Ireland back into its proper place, and pay some attention to the wants of other parts of the United Kingdom. The Parnellites and their allies have boasted that, until a Parliament is given to them on College Green, the Parliament at Westminster shall be rendered useless. If we may judge from published speeches and letters, they have succeeded in making it a terror to many who belong to it. They now exult in the thought, that they have rendered this a permanent condition of affairs. But they totally misjudge the position, as well as the tone and temper, of public opinion. There was a great and most honourable reluctance to place any restrictions upon the perfect freedom of members of the House of Commons. But when it was seen that some of their number were in a conspiracy to abuse this freedom, and to turn it into an instrument of destruction against the House itself—above all, when it became known that members were willing to exercise their privileges for seditious and treasonable purposes—all objections to interference with the ancient customs of Parliament were certain to be set aside. We must respect the traditions of the past, but our pressing business is to deal with the perils of the present. The struggle between the Parnellites and Radicals and the House of Commons can only end in one way. The nation will fortify the House against the shameful alliance, and by some means or other—by means, if necessary, much more rigorous than any we have indicated—the absolute supremacy of the British



British Parliament will be restored. No doubt there may be a good many stormy scenes before this consummation is reached, but it is sure to come. The Conservatives will do well, during the approaching Session, to practise great self-restraint, and to give as little excuse as possible for the charge that they interrupt any speaker whatever. We are aware that a solitary cry of 'hear, hear' has before now been represented as a general and gigantic 'conspiracy to shout down Irish members,' but the public will not long be deceived by artifices of that kind. The Ministry can scarcely fail to see, that their supporters ought to receive fair play. The essential alterations in Procedure ought to be carried without delay, and we may not unreasonably hope that such a Session as that of 1887 will never be witnessed again.

But beyond all this, there will be great need of vigilance and decisive action, if lawful government is to be made victorious over the forces which are arrayed against it. The signs of weakness which we have too long displayed, the readiness to yield to clamour and threats, have given immense strength and encouragement to the enemies of settled rule. We may fairly expect to see open violence and lawlessness repressed in Ireland and elsewhere, but we can scarcely hope to see in our time the last fruits of the fatal seed which Mr. Gladstone has scattered over the Empire. The principles and theories which, under his direction and sanction were disseminated in India by his Viceroy, Lord Ripon, are beginning to work out their inevitable results. In that vast empire a 'foreign' rule is undoubtedly maintained; laws come to the population in 'a foreign garb.' According to Mr. Gladstone's new doctrines, we have no right to remain in India, and the germs of that idea were industriously scattered over the country by Lord Ripon. The natives were entitled to rule; the English were nothing more than interlopers; the time had arrived when India was entitled to 'Home Rule.' Such was the effect of the teaching of Lord Ripon and those who were guided by him, and since then, a large part of the native press, especially in Bengal, has become more aggressive and insolent than ever in its declarations of disloyalty. We are now told that high positions in the government of the country ought not to be held by Englishmen, but should be handed over to Bengalees of the type we have had the opportunity of studying in connection with certain contested elections at home. The least noble and courageous of the races which inhabit India is to be made ruler over the whole continent. The Bengalees have, perhaps, learnt English, after a certain fashion—that is to say, they know how to bring together certain phrases built up from

from dictionaries of synonyms, without reference to sense or meaning. Anglo-Indians are familiar with the classic examples of Hindoo-English which, in the eyes of Lord Ripon and his *entourage*, were regarded as proving the aptitude of the Bengalee to rule over the Mahomedans, the Sikhs, the Rajpoots, and the Mahrattas. A very short experiment in the science of government would send the Hindoo crying piteously for the shelter and protection of the 'British Despotism' under which his race has found that peace and security for life and property, which it never enjoyed until we landed in India, and which it would assuredly lose the moment we departed.

The English people, however, will do well to open their eyes in time to one simple fact, which no well-informed man will dispute. The increasing prevalence in India of the Separatist delusions is not unlikely to involve us in another mutiny, or even to cost us the loss of the country. Everybody knows that our army in India could not alone hold that Empire. We must always depend, and hitherto we have not depended in vain, on the moral and material support of the natives. The recent magnificent offer of the Nizam, to contribute 600,000*l.* towards the frontier defences, and the general loyalty of the great princes, afford ample proof that we may still rely upon receiving this assistance. But it is a serious thing to find that the same theories, which have given us Fenianism and Parnellism to encounter, are being actively promulgated in India by Englishmen as well as by Hindoos. There can scarcely be a question that, if Mr. Gladstone had been permitted to carry out his scheme of disintegration in Ireland, the demand for something of the same kind in India must either have been granted, or we should have had to resist it by force of arms. Meetings demanding 'Home Rule for India' have been held in Bengal, but happily the sturdier races of India have held altogether aloof from them. English Radicalism works only upon the baser material which we have to deal with in our Indian Empire. The importance of proving to all the world that it is not permitted to prevail, even on its native soil, cannot possibly be exaggerated.

How rapidly the contagion of disorder is spreading in Wales must be obvious, even to the most careless reader of the newspapers. Special efforts have been made in that field by Mr. Gladstone himself. Over and over again he has sent the message—though not in words so few or direct—'give Ireland independence, and you shall have it too.' The same offer was made to Scotland, but it has few attractions for a people who are always sufficiently practical to prefer the substance to the shadow. Disestablishment in both sections of the country was  
promised,

promised, in no very equivocal terms, in return for Scotch and Welsh support for the Parnellite policy in Ireland. 'I believe,' said Mr. Gladstone at Newtown, on the 3rd of June, 1887, 'that the cause of Ireland is the cause of Wales.' The wants of Wales had not been properly attended to, her traditions had not been regarded. 'Justice to Wales will follow upon justice to Ireland.' Hints and promises of this kind—and scores of them might be quoted—leave no room for doubt as to Mr. Gladstone's meaning in any mind but his own. The attack upon the church in Wales is only the beginning—as it turns out to have been in Ireland—of the Radical programme. A Land League has already been formed, and considering the results of a similar league in Ireland, it would be a matter for surprise if it did not flourish. We all know that the Irish League produced momentous consequences even in politics. Its action on the relation between landlords and tenants must for ever make it memorable in the history of the whole country. The security for contracts, which was once supposed to form part of the unwritten Constitution of England, as it does of the written Constitution of the United States, cannot be said now to rest upon anything more stable than the caprice of 'statesmen' in search of a popular policy. Rents which have been agreed to even in leases have been lowered, without the application of the tenant or the consent of the landlord. The sacredness of contracts has gone the way of many other principles which were once supposed to be inviolable. We must now, in common prudence, anticipate a revolt against contracts, so far as they relate to rents, in other parts of the United Kingdom besides Ireland. The Welsh Land League is being actively pushed. The poorest classes are able to become members, for labourers are not asked to subscribe more than sixpence per annum, and tradesmen pay half-a-crown. Tithes, of course, are to be taken in hand, and 'fair rents' are to be demanded, based upon the prices of agricultural produce—a principle already conceded by the Legislature. A Land Court is to be established for the settlement of disputes. Leaseholds are to be converted into freeholds, the compulsory sale of land is to be legalised—and here, again, is a principle which Parliament has sanctioned—mining royalties are to be reduced, and the game laws abolished. 'Justice to Wales will follow upon justice to Ireland.' Such was the promise which Mr. Gladstone gave to 'gallant little Wales,' and we are now expected to redeem it.

If all that is necessary to enable a man to get his rent reduced by 30 or 40 per cent. is to agitate, it is difficult to see what reason the English landowner can have for looking upon  
his

his property as secure. There is every probability that the Irish and Welsh Leagues will not always stand alone. The land legislation since 1870 has left this plain lesson impressed upon the popular mind—that, if a man chooses to go on paying his rent quietly, he will doubtless be permitted to do so, but that no one will think any the better of him for it. On the other hand, the man who does not wish to pay his rent has only to join a ‘League,’ and sooner or later Parliament will give effect to his wishes. We are bound in candour to admit, that the Irish Land Law Act of 1887 is calculated to deepen rather than weaken this impression. It is true that at present it seems to be thought that, as Ireland is a wholly ‘exceptional’ country, exceptional measures may be passed for it without risk of establishing dangerous precedents, and even without the slightest chance of producing a demand for similar measures elsewhere. That theory is evidently held quite as strongly by the Conservative party as by the Liberals. Not many years, we may be very sure, will elapse before it receives a tremendous shock. Many of the Gladstonian illusions have vanished into thin air; others still survive, and people believe in them who have no faith in Mr. Gladstone’s peculiar methods. It may, perhaps, be easy to satisfy the statesman or the philosopher that we need not do for England, Scotland, or Wales what we have done for Ireland. But will the multitude take that view? When the shoe pinches, will they not ask to be relieved from it? We shall doubtless find out for ourselves, in a very unmistakable manner, at no distant date.

The virus of Separation has not spread much among the Scottish people, but the continual efforts, which have long been made to excite disaffection in the Highlands and Islands, are producing serious results. There is a ‘crofter party’ in the House of Commons, not large, but noisy and active. It can always count upon the support of a considerable detachment of Radicals, and of the whole body of Parnellites. The Irish have seen, that an uprising of any kind in the remote parts of Scotland would create a diversion in their favour, and assist their cause in proportion as it embarrassed the Government. A certain number of English Radicals would open the gates even to a foreign enemy, if by doing so they could overturn the Government. These factions have combined to fan the crofter agitation. That all rents are a form of oppression unworthy of a free country, that land belongs to the ‘people,’ and that it is the duty of the authorities to support an improvident population—these are the main principles which have been advocated by the demagogues, who masquerade as the ‘friends’ of the crofters.

Wilful

Wilful destruction of deer and sheep, and the recent disturbances in Lewis, are among the consequences of this propaganda. Malicious raids have been made on the estates of landlords who have always dealt generously with the people. Rents, it is said, are too high; but, high or low, it does not appear that they have been paid.\* The Government will be compelled to prove to the misguided people of these regions, that the law is supreme even among their hills and fastnesses, and at the same time it will endeavour to find a means of redressing real grievances. A Commission of Enquiry is at work, and numerous debates have already taken place in Parliament. The case of the crofters is not likely to be disregarded, but the tenantry will be made to understand, that nothing can be gained by outbreaks of lawlessness and violence.

One emphatic warning we take leave to give, and it is that the party, representing a deep and abiding respect for the principle of obedience to the law, must continually bestir itself. The opposite party is restless, eager, active; we cannot afford to be otherwise. Too often it is said, especially in London, 'the question of the Union has been completely argued out; all further words are wasted. Everybody is tired of the discussion.' It may be so in the jaded circles of London life, but it is not so in the great and intelligent North, for instance, as any man who has attended public meetings there can testify. The issue is being perpetually set before the working men in a false light; all the arguments that human ingenuity can devise in favour of the Separatist policy are put forward, in the press and on the platform, in their most specious and alluring forms. Some who were convinced are shaken; others who had never taken the trouble to look closely into the question are deceived by the plea for 'justice to Ireland.' They are told that Ireland is asking for nothing more than equal laws. Treat it as we treat Eng-

\* On the 10th of January, a deputation of crofters waited upon one of the proprietors, Lady Matheson, to demand more land at 'fair rents.' The following incidents, which throw much light on the whole of the crofter question, were reported in the 'Times' of the 11th:—'Four of their number, who were elected by the main body, were ushered into the library of the castle, and they there presented their petition to Lady Matheson, who, having cordially shaken hands with them, read the petition, and afterwards asked the representatives—three of whom were young men of about 22 years of age, the fourth being about 35 years—whether they had paid their present rents. *They replied that they had not.* Further enquiry elicited the fact that about sixty years ago, long before the late Sir James purchased the island, only twenty crofts were in Coll; but that, through the increase of population and the want of migration, *almost four times that number had been formed there . . .* The main complaint seemed, however, to be that their lands were now, *from incessant cultivation, almost entirely run out,* and they would like to get those lands now in the hands of tackmen previous to any attempt on their part to emigrate.'

land, give the people the right of local self-government, grant them freedom, and there will no longer be an Irish difficulty. The Irish leaders have never asked for Separation, and are strongly opposed to it. Patrick Ford and Michael Davitt have no influence in Irish councils. There is no such thing as Fenianism. Mr. Gladstone's scheme would have been easily worked, no friction could have occurred in any part of it, and the Irish leaders unanimously accepted it as a final settlement of Irish demands. The Tories are now governing Ireland by ruthless oppression and coercion, and no man in Ireland can be called free.

These are the statements which are put before the working men in all the large cities and towns of the United Kingdom, and we are told that they ought not to be answered because a small coterie in London is 'tired of the subject.' Perhaps the safer course would be for the members of this coterie to remove themselves from the subject, or the subject from them, and allow other people to go on doing their duty untrammelled by their advice or criticisms. The fact is that, if the Conservatives suspend their educational work, the Separatists will be stimulated to renewed exertions, and the effects will be visible in every election that takes place. So far from laying down our arms, under the idea that the field is all our own, we ought to be quite as much on the alert as we have been in any previous stage of the struggle. Every year brings into the electorate many thousands who were not of age, or not on the registers, at the last general election. We have to satisfy them, that our cause is just, and that our reasons for defending it are good. We have gone over the ground thoroughly, it is true, but we must go over it again and again, as thoroughly and with as much patience as if we had never put a hand to it before. The Irish and their allies are acting on that principle, and the Unionists must not in any respect lag behind them. The Separatists place their hopes largely in audacious denials of the vital facts connected with the question, and it is therefore doubly incumbent upon us to keep these facts well before the nation. For example, a long and plausible letter recently appeared in the 'Times,' signed by Monsignor O'Reilly, in which a crafty, if somewhat abject, appeal was made to the sympathies of Englishmen on behalf of 'Irish Patriots,' who desired nothing better than an opportunity to show their devotion to England. 'During my two visits to Ireland since 1884,' wrote this wily ecclesiastic, 'I never once heard a single person express even a desire for separation.' This may be superficially true; that is, Dr. O'Reilly may not himself have heard 'a  
single

single person' express a desire for separation. But it is essentially untrue, if it is intended to represent the opinions and purposes of the Irish leaders. 'And yet,' Dr. O'Reilly went on to say, 'I have conversed freely with men who are now imprisoned and punished in Ireland as common criminals, such as T. D. Sullivan and William O'Brien. They are the victims of that passionate political prejudice against the phantom separation.' Now, subsequent to the date given by Dr. O'Reilly, Mr. O'Brien publicly stated\* that, when the League had done its work, 'the soil of Ireland would be free, its people owning no master but the Almighty, and owning no flag but the green flag of an independent Irish nation.' On the 20th of August, 1886—*after* Mr. Gladstone's Bills had been produced and 'accepted as a final settlement'—Mr. O'Brien took the trouble to define very clearly, at Chicago, the limits of the new treaty of peace. His statement amounted to this—the Irish people would forgive England when England 'cleared out' of Ireland, and not before. We have, said Mr. O'Brien, told Mr. Gladstone candidly 'that to English rule in Ireland *we are, and will for ever remain, irreconcilable*,' and that the English people must 'haul down the flag of English domination in Ireland.' 'Aspirations which are woven round the very heart-life of our race would never be surrendered'—'the day for holding us to an enforced and detested Union is gone for ever.' Dr. O'Reilly may say that he 'never heard' these declarations, but he must be well aware they were made, and in feigning ignorance of them he is dealing with the controversy in a spirit which Jesuits might admire, but which will never win the approval of Englishmen.

Whenever fictions like Dr. O'Reilly's are put forward to delude the people, they must be met and answered. Look at the case of Mr. Sullivan, another victim of the 'phantom separation.' Mr. Sullivan himself would be the last man in the world to deny, that his chief desire is to see Ireland a separate and an independent nation. In his song 'God save Ireland'—written in praise of the three men ('holy martyrs') who killed the policemen at Manchester—there are these lines:

'Never till the latest day shall the memory pass away,  
Of the gallant lives thus given for our land;  
But on the cause must go, amidst joy or weal or woe,  
Till we've made our isle a nation free and grand.'

Dr. O'Reilly never heard this, perhaps, but his deafness or his blindness cannot alter the facts. And those facts cannot be

---

\* At Gorey, August 23, 1885; 'Irish Times,' August 24.



too often or too clearly driven home into the minds of the people. Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. Healy, all the Irish leaders, here or in America, have repeatedly warned us, that what they want is Ireland for the Irish, and England driven into the sea. Not one of them has ever retracted a word of these warnings. Not one of them has the power or the right to accept Mr. Gladstone's scheme in the name of the Irish people; Mr. Parnell has distinctly told us that he has no such power. Even, therefore, if the Gladstonian Bills of 1886 were passed, ruinous as they would be in their consequences, they would not satisfy the Irish agitators, nor bring about peace between England and Ireland. 'The independence of our country,' said Mr. Sexton, at Dublin so recently as the 16th of January, 1887, 'is the first thought in our hearts, it is the first word upon our banners.' In 1881, the same gentleman said: 'I will not mince my words, and I say that the one prevailing and unchangeable passion between Ireland and England is the passion of hate.' So much for the 'brotherly love' over which Dr. O'Reilly bids us rejoice. It is, by the bye, this same Dr. O'Reilly, as a correspondent of the 'Times' has reminded us, who deliberately published a statement to the effect, that the Phoenix Park murderers were possibly suborned by the Dublin Castle officials. How much the evidence of such a man as this is worth, or what value is to be attached to his interpretations of Irish opinion, we may safely leave the reader to decide for himself.

A survey of the whole position may reveal some sources of disquietude, and much cause for watchfulness, but nothing whatever to justify anxiety or alarm. The forces arrayed against law and order are numerous, but they are neither so numerous nor so powerful as those which are determined to save the country from revolution, and to frustrate Disunion or Separation under any disguise or form. The great body of the working men have as deep a horror of lawlessness and anarchy as the wealthiest merchant or landlord in the country. They will stand by the Government loyally, if the Government will make its actions clear to them, and lay bare all the motives and objects of its proceedings. The instinct of the working classes is to range themselves on the side of law. No doubt some of them are found supporting the Separatist policy; but they have been won over by appeals to their law-abiding instinct—by having been persuaded that, as Mr. Gladstone says, it is the Government which is breaking the law in Ireland, and not the National League. Many of them honestly believe this, or they would lend no countenance to the new Irish alliance. Very few English working men even pretend to regard this alliance  
with

with satisfaction or pleasure. Their leaders tell them it is for the good of the whole country, that by its means we can close up, once for all, the long-standing Irish account. Then will come the millennium. It is not because the working men have any sympathy with disloyalty, still less with crime, that any of their number support Mr. Gladstone. It is because they believe he cannot do wrong. As a Radical speaker told a meeting not long ago, 'Mr. Gladstone has never misled us, and never been mistaken, and he never will be.' Nothing is so hard to shake as popular confidence in a favourite public man. There are thousands of Separatists, or Gladstonians, to-day, who have not, for themselves, made the slightest examination of the Irish Bills of 1866, or who have the least idea what is meant by Home Rule. It may, indeed, be very fairly questioned whether Mr. Gladstone himself knows what he means by it, and it is quite certain that he resents all requests for 'light and leading' as attempts to lead him into a 'trap.' Not sympathy with lawlessness, therefore, but a mistaken belief in Mr. Gladstone's foresight and sound judgment—qualities which his whole life shows that he does not possess—accounts for the fact, that the Gladstonians in the country are still very numerous, though a minority. There is no reason whatever for distrusting the working classes; so far from that, there is every reason why we should put the utmost confidence in them. But it is necessary to keep them well informed, to take care that the events of the day are not misrepresented, to be always on our guard against that Radical 'lying spirit' which once stung Lord Iddesleigh himself to anger. With due caution, persistence, and firmness, the cause of order—which, after all, is the true cause of the whole people—will remain safe in the hands of the Conservative party.

---

THE

# QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

ART. I.—*The Holy Bible, according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611). With an explanatory and critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation.* By Clergy of the Anglican Church. APOCRYPHA. Edited by Henry Wace, D.D. 2 Vols. London, 1888.

IT was a happy idea, though probably demanding a considerable measure of courage for its practical realization, to extend the plan of the well-known and greatly-valued 'Speaker's Commentary' on the Canonical Scriptures, so as to embrace, in a couple of supplementary volumes, the semi-sacred or deuterocanonical writings which constitute what is commonly called the Apocrypha. Strange as it may at first sight seem, that books which are of authority in matters of Christian faith, and books which are confessedly destitute of any such authority, should be compacted together under a common title, and that the most sacred in all literature: it is nevertheless a fact that the Bible of the Anglican Communion is composed of books of both classes, and would be no more complete without the romance of Judith, or the fables of Bel and the Dragon, than it would be without the prophecies of Isaiah, or the Gospel of St. John. No doubt there is something anomalous in this hybrid character of our sacred volume; but, like most anomalies, it is the result of a long historical development. The English Church at the Reformation, true to her character for moderation and dislike of needless change, shrank from severing the Apocryphal books from her Bible, where they had for ages found a place, and was content to state that they are to be read only for example of life and instruction of manners, and are not to be applied to establish any doctrine. On the whole, this distinction has served its purpose. It has been effectual to prevent the confusion and mischief, which might otherwise have arisen from the continued inclusion of these books in the

Vol. 166.—No. 332.

T

Anglican

Anglican Bible; but it has done so in a manner which probably was not foreseen. The English-speaking races have thoroughly mastered the distinction, and in their practical way have given effect to it. As a rule they have demanded and obtained the canonical part of the Bible by itself, and have declined the rest without thanks. Less than twenty years after the issue of the Authorized Version, English Bibles began to be printed and sold without the Apocrypha, in defiance of dire penalties threatened from Lambeth for the offence. Of the myriads of English Bibles now produced every year, only the merest fraction contains the Apocrypha. The great Bible Societies confine their enormous issues of the sacred volume to the canonical books, and absolutely refuse to aid in circulating those which are uncanonical. The strictly Anglican Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge keeps, indeed, the complete Anglican Bible in stock to supply special demands for it; but these demands are found to bear an insignificant proportion to those which are made to it for Bibles unencumbered with the Apocrypha. It makes no difference that within the United Kingdom the printing of the Authorized Version is not in the hands of any of the Societies, but is restricted to a few privileged presses. The Universities and the Queen's printers make no scruple of dividing the Anglican Bible into its two parts, the Canonical and the Uncanonical, and supplying one without the other to their customers. Again, if we look at the Commentaries on the Bible which pour forth from the press in an ever-growing stream, we shall see that not one in twenty embraces the Apocrypha. Still more noticeable has been the action of the most profoundly Anglican institution in the country, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. In the great scheme which has been recently carried out under its sanction for a revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible, not the whole of the Anglican Bible has been dealt with, but only the canonical portion of it; and the work has been universally accepted as complete, just as if there had been no such portion as the Apocrypha which had a claim to be considered. Such has been the practical result of the distinction drawn by the 6th Anglican Article, between the 'Canonical Books' which alone are 'Holy Scripture,' and 'the other Books,' which 'the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but doth not apply to establish any doctrine.'

Now we cannot affect seriously to regret this result. Venerable as the Apocryphal books are, nearly the whole of them being unquestionably older than any part of the New Testament; and considerable as is their value, whether for historical and  
critical

critical uses, or in a less degree for religious edification; they are not Holy Scripture, and are severed from it by an impassable line of demarcation. Their range of excellence is a wide one, ascending from very low depths in the additions to Esther and Daniel, to a fine height in Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. Yet even of the last-named book, which in the Commentary before us Dr. Farrar calls 'in many respects the most valuable of the Apocryphal writings,' he ventures also to affirm, and we think with justice, that 'the book of Wisdom is, as a whole, far inferior to the humblest of the canonical writings.' And this being so, we cannot but admit that for ordinary readers, amidst the hurry and pressure of the modern conditions of life, the Bible placed in their hands for familiar use is well rid of the encumbering element of the Apocrypha. The canonical Scriptures alone make up a very large volume, and are, as Jerome says, a 'sacred library' in themselves. They certainly are sufficient to engross as much leisure, and satisfy as much desire, as the majority of busy Christian people have for devotional reading; and it would be at the expense of the Divine Word, if the Apocrypha besides, which is equal in length to nearly five-sixths of the New Testament, were commonly bound up within the same covers, to offer itself as a rival candidate for the unlettered reader's attention. No one could wish that the fountain of living waters should, in any degree, be forsaken for broken cisterns that hold no water. Moreover, as Dr. Salmon has remarked in his 'General Introduction,' in estimating the value of a book or a sermon for edification, more has to be taken into account than its bare contents. What is profitable in one stage of thought or knowledge may, in another, very seriously fail of its intended effect. The authoritative ruling of the 35th Article respecting the value and use of the Homilies has been utterly ineffectual to prevent them from becoming obsolete, and being banished from our pulpits. The critical spirit which is in the air of modern life is quick to perceive absurdity, where the simplicity of ignorance found nothing but a wholesome lesson; the keener sense of the ludicrous renders it impossible now to listen without unseemly amusement, to stories in which unreflecting acquiescence was unconscious of anything grotesque or provocative of derision. What English congregation of the present day would be likely to derive benefit from listening to a great deal that is to be met with in the shrewd, cynical maxims of Ecclesiasticus, or the rhetorical exaggerations of Wisdom; to say nothing of the grim exploit of Judith, the grotesque experiences of Tobit, and the fables about Bel and the Dragon so foolishly restored to the Anglican Lectionary at

T 2

the

the Savoy Conference, for no better reason, it would seem, than to spite the Puritans? We ask this with the less hesitation, because the voice of the Churches is with us. The tendency to relegate the uncanonical books to the background is unmistakable. No sooner had the Church of Ireland acquired the right of self-government, than it expunged the Apocrypha entirely from its calendar of lessons. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, when in 1789 it moulded the Anglican Prayer-book to its own use, discontinued the reading of the Apocrypha in the daily course, and retained only the twenty-six special lessons for holy days: but it has lately assimilated its Lectionary in substance, though not in every detail, to the new Anglican Lectionary, by striking out twenty-two of the special lessons, and re-instating lessons from the Apocrypha for nineteen days in November. What most nearly concerns us is the recent change in our own Church, which has also been adopted by the Scotch Episcopal Church. In the revised Lectionary of 1871, the period of the daily reading of the Apocrypha was reduced from eight weeks to three, and the number of special lessons taken from it for holy-days from twenty-six to four. Nor do these figures express the entire reduction. Tobit, Judith, Susannah, Bel and the Dragon have disappeared from the Calendar; and the lessons still read from Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch are so much shorter on an average, as well as fewer in number, than the apocryphal lessons in the old Calendar, that the total portion of the uncanonical books now appointed to be read from the lecterns of our churches is less than one-fifth of that to which our forefathers for many generations were accustomed to listen. It will be recollected, however, that besides the lessons ordered by the Calendar two portions of the Apocrypha are permanently imbedded in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer: namely, a portion of the 'Song of the Three Children' as an alternative canticle to the *Te Deum*, and three verses on almsgiving from Tobit in the Offertory Sentences. The mention of 'Thobie and Sara,' which stood in the marriage-service of King Edward's first book, was afterwards expunged, to make way for 'Abraham and Sarah.'

While, however, we feel constrained to allow that the multiplication of Bibles without the Apocrypha, and the diminished use of it in the public services of the Church, are facts by no means to be regretted, we admit that there is something to be alleged on the other side. It would be an evil of some magnitude that the Apocryphal books should fall out of the knowledge of all but Biblical students; yet this is what has to a wide extent

extent been brought about among us by the changes which have taken place. These writings have important uses. They help to fill up, or bridge over, the chasm between the Old Testament and the New. They illustrate, in a very interesting manner, the inner life of the Jewish nation, the steadfastness of its hope, and its endeavour to adapt its faith to the altered fortunes arising out of the dispersion and the loss of independence, while during the silence of prophecy it waited for a new era of Divine revelation. They throw light on the growth of lines of thought, which to an appreciable extent reappeared in the Christian Scriptures, and moulded the earlier theology of the Church. It is remarkable that the Apocrypha, springing as it did out of the bosom of Israel, has been more valued and used by the Christian Fathers than by the Jewish Rabbis, and that it is to the Church, not to the Synagogue, that we are indebted for its preservation. Of the considerable portion of it which was written in Hebrew, either old or new, scarcely a vestige remains of the original texts. Uncared for by the theologians of Judaism, these have perished, and their substance is known to us in no other way than through the translations made use of by Christian readers. The consequence of Christianity having thus adopted, and so to speak become the guardian of, the Apocrypha, has been to entwine it so closely with the literature and art of Christendom, as to render some acquaintance with it essential to the comprehension of much that is recorded in the written page or storied window, or has been bequeathed to us by the masters of painting and sculpture. In illustration of this point, the following remarks may be quoted from Dr. Salmon's Introduction :—

‘In the present general neglect of the Apocrypha, young readers require a commentator to explain to them why Shylock should exclaim, “A Daniel come to judgment,” or why Milton should describe Raphael as the “affable Archangel;” or as

“the sociable spirit that deigned  
To travel with Tobias, and secured  
His marriage with the seven-times-wedded maid.”

Of those who quote the saying, “*Magna est veritas et praevalebit*,” probably a majority could not tell whence it was derived. Christian names still in use—Susan, Toby, Judith—bear witness to the influence once exercised by the books which bear these names, but which would now be seldom thought of in connection with them if it were not that pictures have made the stories familiar to many who do not care to study the books themselves.’

On all accounts, then, we heartily welcome this new Commentary,



mentary, and trust that it may do good work in arresting the rapidly increasing neglect of the Apocryphal books. What special criticisms we may have to make upon it will appear in the course of our subsequent remarks; but we will at once say of it generally, that it appears to be a worthy appendix to the great Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, of which, although unavoidably under the superintendence of a different yet not less capable Editor, it follows the method and form. It brings within the reach of English readers all that is best in the writings of the laborious foreign critics, who during the last hundred years have made a special study of these ancient productions of Jewish thought; and, thus enriched, it may be said to supersede for purposes of careful study all previous attempts in our language to make the comprehension of them easy to the bulk of our people.

We have already remarked, that the anomalous conjunction of uncanonical with canonical books in the Anglican Bible is the result of a long historical development. A great deal of information on this topic will be found, very pleasantly set forth, in Dr. Salmon's 'General Introduction.' The key to the enigma is the existence, before the Christian era, of a double Jewish canon of the Old Testament; a rigorous one which had its birth in Palestine, and a laxer one which grew up in the Jewish Greek-speaking colony at Alexandria. The formation of these canons proceeded on different principles. In Palestine it was held that prophecy had ceased with the building of the second Temple, and that no religious writings of a later date than Malachi, the last of the prophets, were worthy of a place among the inspired Scriptures. But the Alexandrian school of theologians, leavened by Greek philosophy, took a broader view. It held, to use the words of the Book of Wisdom (vii. 27), that the Divine Wisdom is not confined to any single or narrow channel of operation, but 'in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God and prophets.' Hence, during the two or perhaps three centuries of the gradual formation of the Septuagint or Greek Bible in Alexandria, other pious writings than those which were accepted in Palestine were gathered within the sacred collection, as parts of the inspired literature to which the uninterrupted Divine guidance of Israel had given birth. Not that these later books were formally placed on precisely the same level as that which the older occupied. In fact, the older books themselves were divided into classes, to which a graduated scale of reverence was attached. Far above the rest stood the Pentateuch; then, at a considerable distance, followed the bulk of the historical and prophetic books; and  
lastly,

lastly, came a miscellaneous class, known vaguely as writings, the exact limits of which appear to have remained unsettled until after the completion of the LXX. Into this last class the Greek Bible admitted all the books of our Apocrypha which were extant at the time of its completion, *i.e.* all but 2 Esdras, which is of subsequent date, and belongs to a post-Christian time.

We may pause here for a moment to remark, that this extension of the LXX. is the less to be wondered at, since not only in Palestine itself with regard to the Old Testament, but even in the early Christian Church with regard to the New, considerable difficulty was experienced in settling the exact limits of the Canon. Just as, in the natural world, between the animal and vegetable kingdoms, taken collectively, there exists a most palpable and well-defined distinction; and yet between the lower limit of the one and the higher limit of the other there is so close an approximation that it is an arduous task to draw a precise line of demarcation, and decide where the one ends and the other begins: so has it been found with the separation of the Scriptures into canonical and apocryphal. Taken in the mass, the two classes are widely discriminated by their inherent characteristics, and the superiority of the former is incontestable. In the apocryphal class, taken as a whole, we are conscious of a signal loss of the prophetic verve and directness. The marks of decadence are fatally stamped upon it. It lacks simplicity, freshness, the impress of authority and truth. It resorts to palpable fictions, clothes itself in stolen apparel, deals in florid and redundant rhetoric; is stiff, feeble, artificial. The authors themselves seem to be aware that they address their readers without authority; they shelter themselves under assumed personalities borrowed from the nobler epochs of the Past, as if to cover their own insignificance, and get courage to utter their thoughts. Yet when we approach the Apocrypha from the lower limit of the Canonical Scriptures, and pass, for instance, from Proverbs, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and Esther to the best parts of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, or Baruch, the transition is comparatively easy. There is no marked contrast, no shock of abrupt change, to startle us; we experience little, if any, consciousness of passing from what is inspired to what is uninspired. And if we find it to be so with ourselves, who are the heirs of all time, we may well cease to wonder that the compilers of the Greek Bible under the Ptolemies abstained from drawing any very rigid line of distinction, and grouped the two classes of books together, as alike proceeding, albeit in somewhat different degrees, from the same Wisdom of God which in all ages makes holy souls His friends and His prophets.

Now

Now the Christian Church inherited both the Palestinian and the Alexandrian recensions of the Jewish Scriptures, but with this difference; that the former, being in Hebrew, was soon a dead letter to all but a few scholars; while the latter, either in the original Greek text, or in Latin translations from it, came into universal use. The Apostolic writers, indeed, who largely quote from the LXX. and betray some degree of acquaintance with several of the Apocryphal books contained in it, entirely abstain from adducing these as Scripture, and thus show their adherence to the narrower Palestinian canon. But as the second century wore on, the distinction between the two classes of books, alike embraced within the popular Bible, became faint, and the habit grew up of employing them indiscriminately, whether in theological writings, sermons, or ecclesiastical readings. It is true that among scholars the distinction continued to be recognized; and Jerome especially, an expert in Hebrew, helped to keep it alive in the Church by the prefaces to his versions. All the same, the popular practice took the opposite direction; and even the scholars, Jerome himself included, conformed to it when they quitted the critic's seat for the pulpit or the platform. In the absence of any authoritative determination of the question by a general council, the matter remained in this unsettled state all through the Middle Ages down to the Reformation; evidence of which may be seen in the habit of the writers of the Anglican Homilies, who repeatedly quote the Apocrypha as 'Holy Scripture.' But in the crisis of the Reformation, the question of the Canon was forced to the front, and imperatively demanded a decision. The new doctrine, that everything was to be judged by Scripture, made it of paramount necessity to define what the Scripture is to which the final appeal was to be made. To the leaders of the Reformation, both in England and abroad, Jerome's view recommended itself as unquestionably sound. In accordance with it, it was enacted that no books in the Old Testament should be reckoned as parts of Holy Scripture except those which were admitted into the Hebrew or Palestinian Canon: the rest were formally degraded to an inferior rank, but not altogether rejected. They were deprived of authority, but retained for practical edification. Thus came about the admixture of canonical and uncanonical books in our Anglican Bible.

By the great antagonist of the Reformation, the question was solved in the opposite way. The Council of Trent, at the beginning of its sessions, also found the definition of the Canon forced upon it; and never was there a body of divines less equal

equal to the task. During the preliminary discussion not more than thirty members were present; and when the final vote was taken by which the faith of the Church was to be for ever bound, the number had not risen above fifty-three. Still weaker was the Council in qualifications to fit it for discharging its momentous office. As its historian, Paolo Sarpi, records, on the publication of the decree people were amazed that five Cardinals and forty-eight bishops should have taken on themselves to decide so great a question. Not one of them, it was freely said, was eminent for knowledge. Some were purely ecclesiastical lawyers, who had no acquaintance with religion. Of the theologians present, the best were below mediocrity. Of the bishops, the most were mere gentlemen or courtiers, titulars, or occupants of small sees, so that not a one-thousandth part of the Church was represented at all. From the whole of Germany, not a bishop or theologian was present. To this contemporary indictment Dr. Salmon adds, 'None knew Hebrew; only a few knew Greek; there were even some whose knowledge of Latin was held in but low repute.'

Such was the body which undertook to settle finally for the Catholic Church, by an infallible decree, a question which for fifteen centuries had been perplexing Christendom. No sooner was the subject broached, than four different views about the definition of the Canon rose to the surface. Some wished to have two classes of books: those which had always been received, and those which had been considered doubtful and sometimes rejected. Others desired three classes to be designated: those which had never been questioned, those which after being questioned had been accepted, and those which had never been acknowledged as canonical, viz. the Apocrypha. A third party proposed for imitation the provincial Council of Carthage (A.D. 392), which, without making any distinction, drew up a list of the Canonical Scriptures that included all the Apocryphal books except 2 Esdras. Even this did not go far enough for the majority. They insisted on pronouncing sacred and canonical, and to be received, under pain of an anathema, with equal regard and reverence, all the books, entire with all their parts, as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition. The final decree, drawn up in this sense, stamped the Apocrypha, with the exception of 1 and 2 Esdras and the short Prayer of Manasses, with the highest prerogatives of Holy Scripture, and raised the Latin Vulgate to the dignity of an inspired original. How much this audacious hall-marking of the Vulgate means to those who recognize the authority of the Tridentine decree may be seen, as Dr. Salmon reminds us, in  
'the

‘the dictum of a Jesuit writer of the present day, that “the Greek and Hebrew texts are of the greatest value, *as means in order to arrive at the genuine sense and full force of many passages in the Latin Vulgate.*”’

It is probable that controversial reasons greatly facilitated the recognition of the Apocrypha as inspired Scripture by the divines at Trent; for that portion of the Vulgate contains a few texts that Rome can ill spare,—notably the precedent for prayers and offerings on behalf of the dead in 2 Mac. xii. 44, 45, which furnishes a favourite inscription for tombstones in Roman Catholic cemeteries. The most extraordinary thing in the decree is the exclusion from the Canon of 1 Esdras, which certainly has as good a right to be canonized as Judith or Tobit. It forms a part of the LXX., is several times quoted by the Fathers as Scripture, and beyond question was included in the list of the Council of Carthage, which the Tridentine majority professed to follow. There can be little doubt that they blundered through sheer ignorance. They knew so little about the LXX. as to be misled by a few recent imperfect editions into the belief, that there was no Greek original for this particular book; nor were they aware that the 1 and 2 Esdras named in the Carthaginian list did not mean Ezra and Nehemiah, as they do in the Vulgate, but our 1 Esdras of the Apocrypha, and the canonical Ezra and Nehemiah coupled together under the title 2 Esdras as they are found in the great Uncial MSS. of the LXX. A signal illustration was thus furnished of the way in which the Nemesis of error is apt to dog the heels of pretended infallibility.

To complete this sketch of the relation of the Apocrypha to the Canon of Scripture, a few words must be added about the Eastern Churches. As might have been expected, these have evinced even a less amount of interest than the Latin Church showed down to the Reformation, in arriving at any formal and precise definition of Holy Scripture, and to this day there has never been among them any general or authoritative settlement of the question. In 1672, indeed, the Synod of Jerusalem, animated by a desire to crush out Reformed doctrine which was creeping into the orthodox Greek Church from the West, passed a resolution endorsing the Tridentine Canon, and declared that to deny the canonicity of Judith, Susanna, or the Dragon is to reject the Gospels themselves. But, as Dr. Westcott has remarked, this appears to have been an isolated judgment. The more general view in Eastern Christianity is probably identical with that expressed in the authorized Russian Catechism, which accepts the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament, and

and recommends the reading of the Apocryphal books as a useful preparation for the study of the Bible.

What Dr. Salmon has given us on this subject is so good that we cannot help wishing he had found room for more. There are two questions in particular, fitter for treatment in the 'General Introduction' than in any subsequent part of the Commentary, upon which we should have welcomed information from his ample store of knowledge. One of them is the witness of the Apocryphal writings to the development of Judaism; the other, their relation to the Messianic hope of Israel. In the Apocrypha we have, apparently, survivals of three different streams of Jewish thought. One which originated among the exiles in Babylonia and Persia, and was somewhat tinged by Oriental conceptions; a second, which sprang up at Alexandria, and exhibited a Hellenized version of the faith of Israel; a third, the largest, which flowed with the greatest directness from the original fountain of Mosaicism, namely, the Palestinian development under Pharisaic guidance. Inasmuch as each of these streams of thought, embracing history, philosophy, and prophecy, brought some contribution to the great sea of Christian opinion and sentiment into which they all ultimately flowed, it becomes a matter of considerable interest to the student to ascertain in each case the measure of the contribution, and the influence exerted by it on the growth and expression of the Church's theology. But in order to work out adequately the subject thus hinted at, it would be necessary to include an examination of other works, besides those in our Apocrypha, which have escaped the general wreck suffered by the Jewish literature produced in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. It will be recollected that in the Epilogue to Ecclesiastes, which modern critics incline to ascribe to the second, or at the earliest the third, century B.C., complaint is made of the wearisome abundance of books already current at that period. As M. Nicholas remarks in his interesting volume, '*Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs pendant les deux siècles antérieurs à l'ère chrétienne,*' it is certain that long before the Maccabees the Jews had a rich literature which has almost entirely perished. Of this pre-Christian literature, however, a few specimens are known to us besides the books which have had the good fortune to get into the Apocrypha, such as the Psalter of Solomon, the older Sibylline verses, the book of Enoch, and two or three more books of the Maccabees; and it is evident that with these additional materials to swell it, the subject would outgrow the space which a general Commentary could afford to give it.

The

The other matter which we could have desired to see treated by Dr. Salmon would have been less unmanageable. It has been remarked by the learned Jewish theologian, Weill, in his elaborate work '*Le Judaïsme*,' that there have always been two divergent strains of Messianism current among his people: one clinging to the hope of a personal Messiah, who should deliver and exalt the national Israel: the other contenting itself with looking for a wide diffusion of the moral and spiritual dogmas of Judaism, or in other words, an inauguration, in a form suited to the modern conditions of society, of that kingdom of Jehovah which the ancient prophets foretold. Both of these views undoubtedly have their roots in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. But the remarkable thing is, that whereas *there* the doctrine of a personal Messiah occurs far less frequently, and is set forth far less distinctly, than the anticipation of a glorious extension of Jehovah's kingdom among the nations, and indeed seems almost to fade away in the latest books; yet in Palestine, at the beginning of the Christian era, as the New Testament bears witness, it had come to be the centre of religious thought, and the most potent factor in shaping the destinies of Israel. Now, since our knowledge of Jewish thought during the interval between the Old and New Testaments is mainly derived from the Apocryphal books, we naturally interrogate them to ascertain the cause and progress of this great change which passed over the outlook of the nation towards the future. But the answer comes in a shape which itself demands explanation. The Apocrypha is singularly reticent about any Messianic hope in either of the two forms. In what are probably its earliest portions, Tobit and Baruch, which seem to reflect the feelings of Jewish exiles in the far East, we find indeed a clear anticipation of a good time coming for Israel, but it is unaccompanied by any hint whatever of a Messiah. Thus Tobit, in his 'prayer of rejoicing' for the miraculous recovery of his sight, breaks out into prophecy in the following general, but non-Messianic, terms:—

'He will scourge us for our iniquities, and will have mercy again, and will gather us out of all nations among whom He hath scattered us. . . . O Jerusalem, the holy city, He will scourge thee for thy children's works, and will have mercy again on the sons of the righteous. . . . Rejoice and be glad for the children of the just, for they shall be gathered together, and shall bless the Lord of the just. . . . For Jerusalem shall be built up with sapphires, and emeralds, and precious stone: thy walls and towers and battlements with pure gold. And the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl and carbuncle and stones of Ophir. And all her streets shall say, Alleluia:



Alleluia : and they shall praise Him, saying, Blessed be God which hath extolled it for ever.'

Again, in the part of Baruch which is of a later date than the rest of the book, we find an echo, but equally non-Messianic, of the lofty strains of Isaiah :—

'Put off, O Jerusalem, the garment of thy mourning and affliction, and put on the comeliness of the glory that cometh from God for ever. Cast about thee a double garment of the righteousness which cometh from God; and set a diadem on thine head of the glory of the Everlasting. For God will show thy brightness unto every country under heaven. . . . Arise, O Jerusalem, and stand on high, and look about toward the east, and behold thy children gathered from the west unto the east by the word of the Holy One, rejoicing in the remembrance of God. . . . For God shall lead Israel with joy in the light of His glory with the mercy and righteousness that cometh from Him.'

If to these two passages we add the faint and indefinite hope expressed in 2 Macc. ii. 18, 'that God will shortly have mercy upon us, and gather us together out of every land into the holy place,' we shall have exhausted the whole of the testimony borne by the pre-Christian part of the Apocrypha to Israel's hope of a golden age, and shall have failed to discover any conception whatever of a personal Messiah. Neither in the exulting song of Judith, nor in the additions to Esther and Daniel, nor even in the elaborate religious treatises of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, does Messianic doctrine in any form find a place. It is only when we come down to the apocalyptic production which forms the chief part of 2 Esdras, and which must be assigned to the close of the first century A.D., that the Messianic strain breaks out clear and strong. There at last we have a vision of the Messiah coming forth as a lion to deliver Israel and execute judgment on her oppressors; or as a Man, even the Son of God, rising out of the sea, breathing forth fire and tempest to consume the multitude of sinners, and gathering together the scattered tribes of the elect nation to dwell in their own land.

So much for the almost entirely negative attitude towards Messianic doctrine of the various Apocryphal books which have been fortunate enough to find their way into our Bible. It is clear that these, taken by themselves, by no means explain the development of Messianism which was an accomplished fact at the opening of the Gospel history. But, as we have already remarked, there is material outside the Apocrypha which also demands examination. From the Psalter of Solomon, the older Sibylline verses, and the Book of Enoch especially,

we learn that in the century, or century and a half, immediately preceding the birth of Christ, the Messianic hope was rekindled in Palestine, and began to burn with an almost fierce brightness. Combining, then, the testimony of these works with that of the Apocrypha proper, we seem to be brought to the following conclusion. That during the centuries which followed the return of the small band of exiles from Babylon, owing to the mean and dependent state into which the Jews had fallen, and the weakened sense of unity among them, the Messianic hope lay dormant, and gave but feeble signs of its existence down to the era of the Maccabees. Then came a change over the spirit of Israel. The struggle and triumph of that heroic period gave birth in Palestine to a new outburst of patriotic enthusiasm, a new and more ardent hope for the future of the nation; and these feelings finding their appropriate nutriment and expression in the ancient expectation of a heaven-sent Deliverer and King, an eager looking for the Christ became the very soul of the popular faith.

It is time that we should advance from considerations which deal with the Apocrypha as a whole, to say something about the individual books, and the treatment of them in the new Commentary. In consequence of the uncertainty of their dates, to take them in strictly chronological order is impracticable, and we are compelled to fall back, for the most part, on the conventional order in which they occur in our Anglican Bible. In the several 'Introductions' to them in the Commentary will be found ample particulars of the debates to which they have given rise, and the conclusions at which adventurous critics have arrived, whether about their date and authorship, the language in which they were written, the immense variations in some of the texts by which we know them, and the purposes which they were intended to serve. Where all has been carefully executed, with the enlarged apparatus of modern critical science, to make distinctions is almost invidious; but we may go so far as to say, that we have been particularly struck with Mr. Fuller's Introduction to Tobit, Dr. Farrar's to Wisdom, and, in a somewhat less degree, with Dr. Edersheim's to Ecclesiasticus. One feature deserves special mention, as a ground of confidence to the reader amidst the many perplexities which beset the Apocryphal books. It is that union of cautious moderation with openness to new light, which is characteristic of the best English school of Biblical criticism at the present time. In the Commentary this will everywhere be found tempering the frequent rashness of the German, Dutch, and French

French schools, while profiting by their untiring industry and vast erudition.

Esdras 1 and 2, which have no connection with each other beyond the name, have fallen to Mr. Lupton's share. About the former not much need be said. It is but a fragment, ending abruptly in the middle of a sentence; a fact which the Authorized Version conceals by an adroit mistranslation. Evidently written in Greek by an Egyptian Jew, probably for the purpose of conciliating the favour of a heathen ruler, it may be assigned to the beginning of the last century B.C., although Mr. Lupton hesitatingly suggests a connection with the erection by Onias of the temple at Leontopolis, which would put it back half a century more. The contents, with the exception of one section, possess little interest, being merely a free compilation from Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, with arbitrary transpositions which seriously misled Josephus, and threw into inextricable confusion the chronology of the corresponding part of his Jewish History. The excepted section (iii. 1-v. 6), whether original, or, as is more likely, borrowed from some lost source, is of a very different character. It relates, in a lively and dramatic manner, a supposed episode at the court of Darius, of which, in defiance of dates, the youthful Zerubbabel is made the hero. With Mr. Lupton's summary of it we may dismiss the book:—

'Darius, king of the Persians, makes a great feast. When the guests have all departed, he retires to rest, but after a while is unable to sleep. Thereupon three young men, the guards of the royal chamber, agree to compose each a "sentence" on a given thesis, and deposit it, written and sealed, under the king's pillow, to be read when he rises in the morning. The proposition maintained by the first is that Wine is the strongest; by the second, that the King is so; and by the third, that Women are strongest, but Truth above all. In the morning the king summons an assembly of his courtiers, and the three read their "sentences" before them. The arguments for each tenet are given in detail; the supporter of the third ("this was Zorobabel," iv. 13) daring to borrow an illustration from the conduct of the sovereign himself, at which "the king and the princes looked one upon another." His conclusion that the truth "endureth and is always strong; it liveth and conquereth for ever" is hailed with applause. The king bids him ask what he will, and he seizes the opportunity to remind the king of a vow he had made at his accession, to restore the Jews. Darius accedes to his wishes, and issues a firman granting licence to the Jews in his dominions to return, with grants of money and many privileges.'

In 2 Esdras we are ushered into another world of thought. As the book stands it is composite, the first two and the last two

two chapters having been added by one or more Christian writers at a later date, perhaps nearly a couple of centuries after the original was written. In these additions there is little to detain us. It may be mentioned, in passing, that owing to the somewhat unwarrantable transfer to *departed souls* which the old Latin Office for the Dead makes of the promise to the *heathen* of 'everlasting rest' (ii. 34), this passage has enriched the nomenclature of sacred music with the term 'Requiem.' Having noted this, what we have more to remark concerns exclusively the apocalyptic section (iii.-xiv.). The writer personates the canonical Ezra, and professes to write at Babylon in the thirtieth year after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar—an impossible conjunction, since the real Ezra does not appear till a hundred years later. It may be that the pseudo-Ezra intended to hint, in a veiled manner, that he was writing at *Rome* thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus—a date to which, on independent grounds, modern critics for the most part lean. If in the vision of the Eagle, *i.e.* the Roman Empire, in Ch. xi. xii., the twelve wings are the twelve Cæsars, and the three heads are, as seems likely, the three Flavian Emperors, the date indicated would be about the year of Domitian's death, or, as Renan says, in the short reign of Nerva, A.D. 97. Although the original Greek has perished, the work is extant in no less than five ancient versions, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian—a proof of its wide popularity. A romantic incident is attached to the Latin version, by which it was known to Western Christendom. A gap after Ch. viii. 35, apparently irreparable, had existed in all known copies for the last thousand years; but in 1874 Mr. Bensley, of the Cambridge University Library, was fortunate enough to discover the missing passage in a hitherto overlooked MS. of the 9th century preserved at Amiens, and seventy new and very remarkable verses have been added to the chapter.

Like most Apocalyptic works, this of the pseudo-Ezra is at first sight repulsive and scarcely intelligible. There is little to surprise us in the contempt poured upon it by the rough-tongued Jerome, who knew it only by hear-say. Writing against Vigilantius, and punning on his name, he says:—

'You sleep, keeping vigil, and write in your sleep, placing before me an apocryphal book which is read by you and others like you under the name of Esdras, wherein it is written that no one should dare to pray for others after their death. . . . Why take in one's hand what the Church does not receive? Read, if you like, all the feigned revelations of the patriarchs and prophets, and when you have learned them sing them in the women's weaving shops, and propose them

them to be read in your taverns, that you may by them the more readily allure the unlettered rabble to drink.'

When, however, we penetrate beneath the uninviting crust, we find a great deal to interest us. The writer was an ardent Jew, who may perhaps have fought on the ramparts of Jerusalem against the legions of Titus, and whose heart was profoundly pierced by the ruin of his people. Filled with the arrogant pride of the Pharisees, he takes for granted that the world was made for Israel, in comparison of whom 'the other people are nothing, and be like unto spittle;' and he appeals passionately against the injustice of God in suffering His chosen nation to be down-trodden by the heathen:—

'Are they, then, of Babylon [Rome] better than they of Sion? Or is there any other people that knoweth Thee beside Israel? or what generation hath so believed Thy covenants as Jacob? And yet their reward appeareth not, and their labour hath no fruit; for I have gone here and there through the heathen, and I see that they flow in wealth, and think not upon Thy commandments. Weigh Thou therefore our wickedness now in the balance, and theirs also that dwell in the world; and so shall Thy name nowhere be found but in Israel.'

In answer to this impassioned appeal, the angel Uriel, the 'Fire of God,' is sent to listen to his complaints, and declare the mystery of the divine Providence. In the course of the revelations and visions which ensue, the old, insoluble problems come up for discussion, showing the troubled state of the Jewish conscience in that period of dire tribulation. Why was man created, seeing that sin and misery are his portion? Are not the beasts better off, because they 'expect not a judgment, and know not of torments after death'? Was it worthy of God to give Adam the world, and not restrain him from sinning? To make so many, and allow no more to be saved than would be like a drop in a wave? To cause the generations of men to be drawn out in long succession, instead of calling them all into being at once, that judgment might the sooner be accomplished and done with? To these gloomy questionings no satisfactory reply is given, except the assurance of Messiah's speedy coming to redeem the remnant of Israel. The world was nearing her end, as shown by the diminished stature of her children; of the twelve [ten] parts of her period at least ten [nine] and a half had already passed away; what remained was but as the lingering drops after the storm, or the smoke after the flame had gone by; the vision of Messiah hastened to arrive. Whence the practical conclusion:—

'Now therefore set thine house in order, and reprove thy people, comfort such of them as be in trouble, and now renounce corruption; let go from thee mortal thoughts, cast away the burdens of man, put off now the weak nature, and set aside the thoughts that are most heavy unto thee, and haste thee to flee from these times.'

Besides the historical interest which attaches to this strange book, as giving us a glimpse into the thoughts of the Jewish remnant when it lay crushed beneath the iron heel of Rome, there is one still greater for us in the influence which, through its wide circulation and great popularity, the book had upon early Christian ideas. It gave to angelology the archangel Uriel, to complete the glorious quaternion—Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael being the others—who stand at the four corners of the throne of God. It set on foot the legend of the lost ten tribes of Israel, mysteriously hidden in the depths of the East, in Arsareth, the 'other land,' a 'country where never mankind dwelt,' awaiting the day in which Messiah should lead them back to their own land; and the still more extraordinary myth of the reproduction by Ezra from memory of the entire Old Testament which had been burnt, besides seventy works for the initiated, containing 'the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge.' Its doctrinal influence also appears to have been considerable, and far from profitable. While reading its harsh statements about the tremendous consequences of Adam's sin, the extremely small number of the saved, the eternity of torment by hell-fire, the satisfaction of the redeemed minority in contemplating the punishment of the reprobate, God's arbitrary favouritism of the few and His appalling indifference to the perdition of the multitude, one cannot help connecting in some degree with them the growing obscurization of the Gospel in the popular creed by accretions of a similar kind. To the dreams of mystics and searchers into futurity the book has contributed its quota. It was a favourite with that remarkable enthusiast, Antoinette Bourignon, who prophesied in Flanders in the eighteenth century, and whose works in seventeen volumes found such acceptance in Scotland soon after her death, that the Kirk took alarm, and in repeated Acts denounced 'Bourignonism,' with somewhat needless vehemence, as 'impious, pernicious, blasphemous, and damnable.' In England the chief attraction of the book lay in its predictions, especially the vision of the Eagle in chaps. xi., xii., which offered a fine field for the would-be prophets to cultivate. In an anonymous volume, printed partly in black letter in London in 1610, with the title, 'A prophesie that hath lyen hid above these 2000 yeares,'

yeares,' the vision is made to foretell that the Papacy would be destroyed in 1666. A century later Sir John Floyer, of cold-bathing notoriety, in a small work, entitled, 'An exposition of Revelations, &c., printed for Mr. Johnson,\* Bookseller at Lichfield, 1719,' cites the same vision in proof that Rome would be finally destroyed by Mahometan pirates in 1866. And as if these fits of folly recurred at intervals of a hundred years, in 1814 we find the well-known speculator in antichrist, J. Hatley Frere, weaving the vision into his 'Combined View,' with the result that Rome is to fall 1822-3, and the Millennium to commence 1867. More interesting than these vagaries, though in reality not better founded, is the appeal to the book by Columbus to prove the ease with which the further side of India might be reached in a westerly voyage. In this the illustrious navigator followed the lead of Cardinal D'Ailly, in whose remarkable treatise, 'Imago Mundi,' written at the beginning of the fifteenth century, a chapter is devoted to discussing the proportion of dry land to water on the earth's surface. After saying that many have been led to doubt whether the sea covers so much of the world as some have held, the Cardinal adds that 'on this side may be cited the authority of Esdras in his fourth book, who says (vi. 42) that six parts of the earth are inhabited, and the seventh is covered by the waters.' Now of the Cardinal's works Columbus was a student, and of the 'Imago Mundi' a copy is preserved at Seville enriched with his notes. Further, writing from Hispaniola to his sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella, under date 1498, he refers to the Cardinal's use of this passage from Esdras, and deduces from it the comparative shortness of the oceanic lines of transit. But we have said enough to indicate how varied are the sources of interest in the pseudo-Ezra's apocalypse, and we only add a regret, that Mr. Lupton has not found more room in his scanty Notes to furnish the English reader with helps to appreciate it.

The pretty story of Tobit comes next. In passing to it from the previous book, one feels as if suddenly transported from the storm-swept ocean into some land-locked harbour where the vessels are sleeping peacefully on their shadows. It has fallen to Mr. Fuller, who alike in his Introduction and Notes evinces almost more than his usual thoroughness. Indeed, full of curious information as are his two Excursuses, on the original language, and on the angelology and demonology, we can fancy the Editor making a wry face over their amplitude, and pressed

---

\* Father of Dr. Samuel Johnson.



by anxious thoughts about the necessity of curtailment. The charm of the story lies in its picture of domestic piety in a Jewish family, living in Mesopotamia during the Persian period, and steadfastly cleaving to its religion while waiting in exile for the dawn of brighter days for Israel. Numerous as are the absurdities in the plot, connected with Tobit's blindness and its cure, the archangel's disguise as a serving-man, and the demon's pranks and discomfiture, they scarcely impair the agreeable effect, owing to the simple, childlike manner in which the narrative is related. One could wish to know a little more about the origin of the story, but almost everything that might have enlightened us has sunk into oblivion. Extant in eight different texts, two Hebrew, one Chaldee, two Greek, two Latin, one Syriac, the most certain thing about them is that not one of these is the original. Whether this was in Hebrew, Chaldee, or Greek, is hotly disputed. Mr. Fuller inclines to one of the Semitic languages, but cannot decide between them. Equally contested are the place and time of writing, and the author's special purpose. One of the most curious facts about the book is the origin of the version of it in the Latin Vulgate. Before Jerome's time Tobit was familiar to Christians both in Greek and Latin: but the great translator's episcopal friends, being dissatisfied with those versions, begged him for a new one. Thus pressed, he applied, as he himself tells us, to a learned Jew who possessed a Chaldee copy; from this the Jew translated *vivâ voce* into Hebrew, and sentence by sentence Jerome re-translated into Latin, which was taken down from his lips by an amanuensis. No sooner was this accomplished than the Chaldee document vanished into the darkness out of which it had for a moment emerged, and no version in that language was known to exist till the accidental discovery of one in some MSS. bought a few years ago at Constantinople for the Bodleian at Oxford. Here then, it might be supposed, Jerome's original had turned up at last. But strange to say, this newly found text does not agree by any means with the Vulgate, and is apparently a translation from the Greek of the Sinaitic LXX. ! Of the extant texts the Vulgate is the most expanded, and supplies many touches which are not in our Authorized Version; such as the reason (ii. 10) why blindness was permitted to afflict so good a man as Tobit; Raphael's directions to Tobias to practise continency during the first three days after his marriage (vi. 15), and his conversation with Raguel about the peculiar circumstances of the case (vii. 11); the address of Tobias to his bride before their prayer (viii. 5); Gabael's subsequent fervid blessing of them both (ix. 6); and the running on of the dog in front of the party on  
their

their return, wagging his tail for joy at recognizing Tobit and Anna (xi. 9).

As a specimen of the manipulation of a refractory text by a resolute critic, Mr. Fuller tells a story which is too good to be passed over. The book of Tobit, according to the Greek text, begins by informing us that Tobit's native town was Thisbe, 'which is at the right hand of that city which is properly called Nephthali in Galilee above Aser.' As other texts call the place Gebuel, the real name, says our critic, may be found in the compound Thisbe-Gebuel. But where is such a town to be discovered? It must be on the right of Kadesh-Napthali above Hazor, for those are clearly the two adjoining places which guide us to it: and another text adds, that Hazor lay to the west. A further indication is given by three other texts, which mention a town on the opposite side; only in the name of this town no two of them agree; one calling it Raphain, another Sephet, and the third Phogor. Can the same place be meant by all three? Yes, replies the critic, and proceeds to reduce the names to identity. There is a Seph or Sephet in Galilee, which the old Latin translator blunderingly read Reph, and then modified into Raphain. This Sephet stands on a hill, whence it might be known as Sephet-hor, which easily slipped into Sephegor, and thence by elision into Phegor or Phogor. Thus we get the well-known Safed, of Crusader fame, as our additional indication. Now, without being over-particular as to what is meant by right and left in the varying texts, we find the town of Gischala fairly answering to the conditions, but unfortunately it looks curiously different from Thisbe-Gebuel. Can this difficulty be got over? Certainly, says our critic; nothing easier! Change th into g, and Thisbe becomes Gisbe: transpose the letters of Gebuel, and you get Chalab; put together Gisbe and Chalab, and Gischalab is the natural result: drop the final consonant, and there you are!

The date assigned to Tobit by speculative critics varies from the seventh century B.C. to the second A.D., but the extremes may be dismissed as incredible. Ewald says, the fourth B.C.; Mr. Fuller puts it two centuries later. In fixing on this period he lays stress on the most prominent features of the story, the parts played by the good and bad spirits, Raphael and Asmodeus. After showing that the conception in each case is an intermediate one between the doctrine of the Old Testament, and the extravagant development of it in the Rabbinical literature, he sums up by saying, 'The Raphael and Asmodeus of Tobit could not have been depicted in Biblical times, and they would have been rejected as insufficient in Talmudical. They fall into  
their

their natural era when they are assigned to the second or first century before Christ.' As to the demon, one scarcely knows whether to laugh or lament over the useless expenditure of time and trouble by a bevy of commentators, in the endeavour to bring his grotesque story within the bounds of belief. Specimens of their discussions, grave in themselves, however trying to the reader's gravity, may be found in Calmet's 'Dissertation on Asmodeus.' In what manner, they seriously enquired, can a spirit be smitten with a maiden's charms, or feel jealousy of her bridegroom? Was it really his malice, or some poisonous humour in Sarah, which killed her seven husbands in succession on the bridal night? How can a spirit receive an impression from smoke, or be incommoded by a disagreeable smell? Did the smoke of the fish's liver frustrate the demon's malice by purging Tobit and Sarah from carnal inclinations, and thus rendering them unassailable; or was it merely a symbol of devout prayer prevailing with God: or did the efficacy of the smoke arise from the fact, that the fish was a type of Christ? Again, what was meant by the binding of the demon in Egypt? Is he confined still to that country, and is he free to do his wicked pleasure there? In regard to the last question, Mr. Fuller, referring to the Article on St. Antony in the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography,' alludes to a suggestion—which will be found in Dr. Gutberlet's 'Tobit,' and may be traced back to Calmet, if not further—to the effect, that the presence of Asmodeus in Egypt may explain the frequent temptations to sensuality by which the monks in the Thebaid were assailed! More curious still is the reference to the story in the quaint and once popular '*Voyage du Sieur Lucas au Levant.*' Travelling early in the eighteenth century under the patronage of Louis XIV., he heard in Egypt of a serpent domiciled in the Grotto of Taata, which nobody could kill. A prince, he was told, had tried to destroy it, by cutting it into thirty pieces which were enclosed in as many vases: but the vases being uncovered after a short interval were found empty, and the reptile re-appeared in its haunt as whole and vigorous as ever. Clearly a demon, said the Catholic priests with whom he conversed about it, and no doubt the Asmodeus of Tobit. Lucas himself, stimulated by curiosity, went afterwards to Taata, and was fortunate enough to get a glimpse of the creature. Approaching its abode, he saw it creep out, and twine itself caressingly round the limbs of the persons in front of him: but on his declining in turn to submit to this unpleasant familiarity, the uncanny beast turned away in a huff, and disappeared among the rocks.

The '*Additions to Esther*,' to which we now pass on, are also undertaken

undertaken by Mr. Fuller. They are described by Jerome as 'Schoolboys' themes,' and are of little interest. In style they betray a different hand from that of the translator of Esther in the LXX., but when they were incorporated with the canonical book is unknown. They seem to have been intended to fill up gaps in the genuine narrative, and to impart to it a more distinctly religious tone; but they effect this purpose at the cost of introducing contradictions of fact and anachronisms of sentiment. Of the latter, the most noticeable occur in the prayer of Esther, before she ventured unbidden into the presence of Ahasuerus. Here, entirely at variance with the original representation, she declares her utter abhorrence of her station as the King's consort, and protests before God that she submitted to occupy it only out of dire necessity; a hint on which the Rabbis, after their manner, founded the statement that, whenever she was summoned to the King's chamber, a ghostly double was substituted for her, so that she was never defiled by sharing 'the bed of the uncircumcised.' In an earlier part of the prayer she confesses that the guilt of her people is the cause of their peril from Haman's plot, using language which points rather to present than to past sins. In the genuine book there is not the slightest hint of this, but it was too suggestive to be left unimproved by the Rabbinical commentators. How good a thing they made of it may be seen in the following 'Midrash,' which we abridge from Mr. Fuller's note:—

'Haman, that he might prevail against Israel, said to Ahasuerus, "Their God hates debauchery: give a feast, get loose women, and command the Jews to come to it." Mordecai charged them to refuse; but they went, to the number of 18,500, ate, drank, became intoxicated, and gave themselves up to lust. Then Satan accused them before God, saying, "Destroy them out of the world, for they show no penitence." But God replied, "What then will become of the Law?" Satan urged Him to be content with having only spirits to worship Him: and God yielded, and sent for a roll on which to write a decree for the destruction of the Jews. Then the Law, drest in widow's weeds, and weeping so that the ministering angels were moved to tears, cried to God, saying, "Lord of the world, if Israel perishes, of what use shall we, Thy commandments, be any longer?" The sun and the moon heard her wail and eclipsed their light. Then ran Elijah to arouse the sleeping patriarchs that they might intercede, but in vain. "What can we do?" they replied; "were not we punished for our disobedience?" Elijah then went to Moses and implored his intervention. "Is there a good man among them?" he asked. "Yes," was the answer, "his name is Mordecai." "Go, tell him to persevere in prayer," rejoined Moses. But Elijah pleaded, "Alas! true shepherd, the decree for the destruction

tion of Israel is already issued." "If it be sealed with clay," replied Moses, "our prayer can be heard; but if with blood, it is irrevocable." "It is sealed with clay," exclaimed Elijah. "Then go," answered Moses, "and let Mordecai know."

We turn back now to Judith, which follows Tobit in our Bible, and in conjunction with the additions to Daniel has been assigned to Mr. Ball in the Commentary. As we found a vivid contrast in passing from 2 Esdras to Tobit, so another, but different in kind, strikes us as we take the next step to Judith. A scene of domestic peace in humble life is exchanged for the pomp of war, the clash of arms, and a drama of heroic self-devotion. We feel in the air the spirit of Jael and Deborah; a fierce patriotism which will strike any way, however foully, so that it may be able to raise the exulting cry, 'So let all Thine enemies perish, O Lord!' The story is too well known to need any description. Its fascination is evinced by its two prime incidents,—the decapitation of Holofernes in his drunken sleep, and the triumphant return of the heroine bearing the bloody head,—having become stock-subjects in art. We can recollect having seen the action represented with much spirit in Italy by *marionette*, as a popular entertainment. Perhaps the eulogium passed on the book by Dr. Scrivener is not greatly excessive:—'a fine work, grave, elevated, pious, chaste in thought and expression, exquisitely finished.' That it is in every part a fiction is probable; the setting, at least, is absolutely unhistorical. It is based on a fundamental contradiction—the alleged existence of the Assyrian Empire in the days of Nebuchadnezzar; in the eighteenth year of whose reign over it, when the Jews 'were newly returned from the captivity,' the events are placed—that year being in reality the epoch of his destruction of Jerusalem. Besides, as Mr. Ball remarks, 'the account of the campaigns of Holofernes bristles with political, geographical, and strategical impossibilities.' It is plain that the author uses his names and dates as a mere disguise to cover allusions to recent events. Nebuchadnezzar, a proverbial type of the tyrannous oppressor of Israel, may have stood for their savage foe Antiochus. In the same way Holofernes, a name probably suggested by the Cappadocian usurper Orophernes in the early part of the Maccabean period, may be a mask for Nicanor, the Syrian general, who 'bare deadly hate unto Israel,' and fell in battle against the heroic Judas. However this may be, the book, written in Hebrew which has perished, and betraying a decided tinge of Pharisaism, cannot be earlier than the rise of the Maccabees, and may be placed between 170–100 B.C. Renan's idea that the book was written at Be'ther, near Jerusalem,

Jerusalem, A.D. 80, seems very fanciful, and rests on little but the absence of any mention of it by Josephus. What one could wish to be sure about is, whether it was a genuine trumpet-blast to rouse the Jews to fight to the death against Syria for their religion; or whether it was nothing more than the pleasant work of a romance-writer, in the quieter days which followed. Mr. Ball inclines to the latter view, and we fear the bulk of the evidence is on his side.

As the three additions to Daniel, commonly called 'The Song of the three Children,' 'Susanna,' and 'Bel and the Dragon,' together with the short 'Prayer of Manasses,' fall to the same commentator, it will be convenient to notice them here. They are quite as fully treated as such trifling pieces deserve: and we are glad to observe that the Notes do not present the reader with any long untranslated German quotations, such as encumber the Introduction to Judith. Mr. Ball is undoubtedly right in tracing these morsels to hints in the canonical books, which supplied openings for amplification by Jewish scribes. The gem of them all is the 'Benedicite' of the liturgies, of which Mr. Ball well observes,

'The monotony of form is itself effective. It is like the monotony of the winds or the waves, and powerfully suggests to the imagination the amplitude and splendour of God's world, and the sublimity of the universal chorus of praise.

What Mr. Ball says of the intention of Susanna, the story of which is probably founded on a Babylonish legend, is new to us. He argues, with considerable cogency, that the glorification of the youthful Daniel is but a secondary feature, and that the work is 'an anti-Sadducean *Tendenz-Schrift*, the object of which is to portray certain deplorable defects inherent in the administration of justice, and to suggest a radical cure.' In tracing analogues to the story of the Dragon, he has omitted to notice the use made of it by Defoe in the 2nd part of 'Robinson Crusoe,' where of course a wooden idol is substituted for the live monster of the Apocrypha. The Targum quoted at the end of the short 'Prayer of Manasses' is worth noticing, as embodying, though in the usual grotesque form, a nobler conception of the divine mercy than that which was generally current among the Rabbis. The idolatrous monarch is supposed to be undergoing torture, by being shut up in a hollow copper mule, placed in the midst of a great fire. In his agony he cries first, but in vain, to his idols, and then turns with humiliation to the true God. The angels, however, who preside over the gates by which prayer enters heaven, abhorring him

him for his vileness, close all the windows and lattices of heaven, that his prayer may not penetrate the holy place. But the Lord Himself, more pitiful than His angels, opens a little lattice under His own throne, and receives the wretched suppliant's cry. The world is shaken, the mule bursts asunder, Manasses is restored to his throne, and knows henceforth that the Lord is God alone.

The following extract from Mr. Ball's Introduction to the Song of the three Children is so valuable in its bearing on the critical use of the remains of sacred Oriental literature, that we must make room for it:—

'We have to bear in mind a fact familiar enough to students of the Talmudic and Midrashic literature, though apparently unknown to many expositors of Scripture, whose minds conspicuously lack that *orientation* which is an indispensable preliminary to a right understanding of the treasures of Eastern thought; I mean the inveterate tendency of Jewish teachers to convey their doctrine not in the form of abstract discourse, but in a mode appealing directly to the imagination, and seeking to arouse the interest and sympathy of the man rather than the philosopher. The Rabbi embodies his lesson in a story, whether parable or allegory, or seeming historical narrative; and the last thing he or his disciples would think of is to ask whether the selected persons, events, and circumstances which so vividly suggest the doctrine are in themselves real or fictitious. The doctrine is everything; the mode of presentation has no independent value.'

We arrive now at the two *pièces de résistance* of the Apocrypha, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, which furnish nearly all the Apocryphal lessons now read in our Churches. In an uncritical age both used to be ascribed to Solomon, and to be numbered with Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles as making up five works from his pen; a doctrine, we are sorry to say, that we have heard glibly enunciated from an Anglican pulpit! One would have thought that of the two reasons given by Calmet, a century and a half ago, why even Wisdom could not be Solomon's,—that he would not have repeated himself, nor have quoted from Isaiah and Jeremiah—the second at least might have been accounted as decisive, as the first of the nine reasons offered by a certain Corporation for not welcoming their Queen with a joy-peal, viz. that they had no bells. But while a Solomonic origin is confessedly impossible for either book, the real dates are variously conjectured: the only points about which there is unanimity being these,—that Ecclesiasticus, written in Hebrew, preceded Wisdom, written in Greek; and that the older of the two cannot be put back earlier than the third century B.C.

Wisdom



Wisdom has been placed in Dr. Farrar's hands, whose study of Alexandrian Judaism well qualifies him to be its exponent. For the book is saturated with Hellenism, and as 'a synthesis of Jewish, Platonic, and Stoic elements' (to use Dr. Cheyne's phrase), is a characteristic product of the place where the Old Testament first came into close contact with Greek philosophy. What we see in it is the aspect under which the ancient religion of Israel appeared to a learned and pious Jew, who regarded it, not from the narrow and isolated standing-point of Palestinian Rabbinism, but from the school of Hellenic culture, and still found it to be incomparably superior to anything which paganism could offer. The puzzle is to fix the date between the rise of Alexandrian Judaism, and the earliest spread of Christian doctrine. Of the latter it betrays no trace, although, as Ewald says, it may in a sense be regarded as 'a premonition of St. John and a preparation for St. Paul'; and it cannot therefore be reasonably brought down lower than the middle of the first century A.D. On the other hand, its exaggerated rhetoric, its 'singular mastery of the Greek language in its later epoch of mingled decadence and development,' its saturation with Greek ideas, its advanced eschatology, all conspire to point to a late period. Dr. Farrar accordingly dissents from the older views which placed the book somewhere in the second century B.C., and brings it down to the decade after the death of Christ.

It can scarcely escape any attentive reader's notice, that the earlier part of the book, ch. i.-ix., is superior in style and arrangement to the rest, and that at its close the impersonation of Solomon is dropped, except that what follows continues to be in form of an address to God, as if it was a continuation of Solomon's prayer in ch. ix. The wild and grotesque exaggerations, the tumultuous verbiage and rhetorical dilettantism, which often disfigure the latter portion, are not met with in the earlier. It is only in the concluding part that we find the sacred history distorted by bombastic amplifications which good taste must condemn: as that the Nile was turned into mire-clotted blood, to avenge the drowning of the Hebrew infants in it by a former Pharaoh; that the flies and lice and frogs were miraculously preserved through the flames and lightnings that burned up the fruits of the earth, that they might continue to torment the Egyptians; that the plague of darkness, which no artificial light could mitigate, was aggravated by monstrous apparitions and terrible noises out of the abysses of intolerable hell; and that in the midst of the Red Sea the Israelites marched through a grassy plain, going at large like horses and leaping

leaping like lambs. On the whole it is not surprising that the change of style should have led to doubts of the unity of the book, and provoked speculation as to the number of hands concerned in its production—one guess even reaching to the ludicrous extent of seventy-nine different composers; but we are convinced that Dr. Farrar is right in saying, ‘Of the unity and completeness of the book there can be but little doubt.’

The space at our disposal must limit to a very few our notices of special points of interest. One is the encumbering of the doctrine of immortality by the Platonic idea of the pre-existence of souls; which was held also by Philo, and reappears in New Testament Judaism, and was improved into the Rabbinical belief, that the souls of all unborn Jews were assembled at Sinai to hear the Law delivered! But this idea does not prevent a very noble conception of the future blessedness of the righteous, though it is unaccompanied by any hint of a resurrection. In the beautiful verse, ‘The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them,’ may probably be found the reason why the older Anglican lectionaries forbade the reading of the last verse of Ecclesiasticus xlv., which asserts that Samuel was really brought up from his rest, by the witch’s incantation, to prophesy to Saul. Another point of interest is the introduction into the phraseology of Biblical Ethics of the Greek equivalent for *conscience*, which occurs in the sentence, ‘Wickedness, condemned by her own witness, is very timorous, and being pressed with conscience always forecasteth grievous things.’ It is also through our book that the four cardinal virtues passed from Plato into the medieval theology; they are found in the saying about Wisdom, ‘She teacheth temperance and prudence, justice and fortitude.’ The striking remark about Enoch, ‘He, being made perfect in a short time, fulfilled a long time,’ has acquired a new interest for Englishmen, through its application by Hooker ‘to that admirable child,’ Edward VI., and its inscription by Queen Victoria on the monument in the Highlands to her husband ‘Albert the Good.’ The book has also given to modern science the term ‘protoplast,’ which it twice uses of Adam. For its more general influence we must refer to Dr. Farrar’s excellent Introduction, and be content to endorse his assertion that ‘it undoubtedly holds an important position in the *Præparatio Evangelica*—the development of thought and circumstances which prepared the way for the Gospel of Christ.’

Ecclesiasticus offers in many respects a marked contrast to Wisdom. Being probably more than two centuries older,—its conjectured

conjectured date ranging from about 240 to 180 B.C.—it felt but little of the vivifying breath which quickened the later book, and is far less satisfactory both in its religion and its ethics. Hope beyond the grave is unknown to it, and the motive of its morality is a temporal recompense. Yet it has great excellences. Its vast stock of proverbial sayings and gem-like apothegms, partly collected and partly original, touch human life at all points, sometimes coarsely, sometimes cynically, but always with shrewdness and insight, and occasionally with a fine and delicate stroke which commands our admiration. We see in it the thoughts of one who had travelled beyond the petty round of Palestinian towns, and had gone through many experiences; one who in the calm of his old age sat among the wise men, whose vocation it was to bring down the more idealized teaching of the prophets to the level of the common people, and reconcile the severity of the law with the needs of daily life. Now and then the writer breaks out into a nobler strain, but the effort is too great to be sustained, and the reaction is abrupt and saddening. Occasionally the most attractive sayings are found to be due to the supposed Hellenizing grandson, who in Egypt, sixty years later, translated the Hebrew original into Greek, or to some still later and probably Christian hand. It reaches its apogee in its fine eulogy on Wisdom (ch. xxiv.), and its noble Song of Praise passing into the 'Hymn of the Fathers,' from which Hebrews xi. is imitated; its perigee in its frequent sarcasms on women, its bitterness against enemies, its mercenary view of duty and service. Notwithstanding its comparatively early date and Palestinian origin, it betrays on the whole a Hellenistic flavour, caught from the considerable Greek population settled within Palestine itself, as well as girdling its borders. In fact, as Dr. Edersheim observes, it marks the commencement of a period of transition, when the rigid crust of the older Judaism was beginning to yield to outside pressure:—

'We are in the presence of new questions originating from contact with a wider world; and we find them answered in a manner which in one direction would lead up to Jewish Alexandrian theology, while the book itself is still purely Palestinian. From one aspect therefore it may be described as Palestinian theology before Alexandrian Hellenism. From another aspect it represents an orthodox, but moderate and cold, Judaism—before there were either Pharisees or Saducees; before these two directions assumed separate forms under the combined influence of political circumstances and theological controversies. . . . But beyond all this, the book throws welcome light on the period in which it was written. If we would know what a cultured, liberal, and yet genuine Jew had thought and felt in view  
of

of the great questions of the day; if we would gain insight into the state of public opinion, morals, society, and even of the manners of that period,—we find the materials for it in the book of *Ecclesiasticus*.’

As might be expected from Dr. Edersheim’s large acquaintance with Jewish literature, his Introduction and Notes, in which he has derived valuable aid from Mr. Margoliouth, furnish all that is needed in the way of textual criticism. We doubt, however, if he has not placed the date rather too early, B.C. 235, or earlier; and also laid more stress than is quite justifiable upon alleged references to *Ecclesiastes*, in proof of an earlier date for that canonical book than modern critics generally are willing to allow. What seems more particularly Dr. Edersheim’s own is the abundant evidence brought forward by him to prove, that the Syriac version was not made from the Greek, but directly and independently from the original Hebrew. If this be so, that version furnishes important help to check the work of the Greek translator, who confesses himself to be somewhat unfamiliar with Hebrew, and to enable us to ascertain how far he understood the more difficult phrases, and what liberties he allowed himself to take with the original to give it a more Hellenistic air. At the same time the Syriac version must be used with caution, since it shows traces of arbitrary modification in a Christian sense. Dr. Edersheim goes so far as to say that ‘the Syriac has the character of a Targum, and was certainly intended in great measure as an *Ecclesiasticus*, or Church-book, for homiletical or catechetical purposes.’

On the literary side we confess that we should have liked the Notes to be fuller. With the exception of reminding us that both St. Bernard of Clairvaux’s Jubilee-rhythm, ‘De nomine Jesu,’ and Rinkart’s fine hymn, ‘Nun danket alle Gott,’ composed at the end of the Thirty Years’ War, are largely indebted to our book, he has not, so far as we have noticed, afforded any information about what may be styled the literary connotations of the ‘Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach.’ An interesting one is supplied by Dr. Salmon, who recalls how Bunyan was roused from the profound gloom into which the dread of being reprobate had plunged him, by recollecting the passage, ‘Look at the generations of old, and see; did any ever trust in the Lord and was confounded?’ (ch. ii. 10.) This sentence, he records in his ‘Grace Abounding,’ fell with weight on his spirit, and greatly enlightened and encouraged him, although for more than a year he could not trace it to its source in the *Apocrypha*: ‘that word,’ he adds, ‘doth still at times shine before my face.’ We will adduce another from the ‘Spectator,’ No. 68, where the apothegms about friendship are singled out for special commendation.

dation. 'How finely,' writes Addison, 'he describes the art of making friends by an obliging and affable behaviour! With what prudence doth he caution us in the choice of friends! With what strokes of nature, I could almost say of humour, has he described the behaviour of a treacherous and self-interested friend!' Then fixing his attention particularly on the verse, 'A faithful friend is the medicine of life, and they that fear the Lord shall find him,' he goes on:—

'I do not remember to have met with any saying that has pleased me more than that of a friend's being the medicine of life, to express the efficacy of friendship in healing the pains and anguish which naturally cleave to our existence in this world; and am wonderfully pleased with the turn in the last sentence, that a virtuous man shall as a blessing meet with a friend who is as virtuous as himself. There is another saying,' he adds, 'in the same author, which would have been much admired in a heathen writer: "Forsake not an old friend, for the new is not comparable to him: a new friend is as new wine; when it is old, thou shalt drink it with pleasure." (ch. ix. 10.)'

The short book of Baruch is avowedly a composite work, inasmuch as the last chapter, the so-called 'Epistle of Jeremy,' is a mere appendage, attached for convenience to the pretended work of the prophet's disciple and friend. But it is composite also in another sense, as the commentator upon it, Dr. Gifford, in agreement with many other critics is constrained to admit. If the contents are carefully examined, a break is found in the character of the book at ch. iii. 9, dividing it into two clearly defined sections. The first consists of Baruch's prayer introduced by its historical preface; the second contains the praise of the Law, as the final manifestation of the divine wisdom, and concludes with predicting in a fine strain the redemption of Israel. Perhaps it would be fanciful to say, with Ewald, that these three topics form a type of the contemporary worship, consisting of prayer, praise, and an elevated prophetic conclusion. But it is manifest that the second section differs greatly in style and method from the first. The first is a cento from the canonical books, and has been characterized, perhaps rather ill-naturedly, as an exercise in the language and style of the prophets composed by some scribbler, or as the theme of a feeble schoolboy stringing all sorts of passages together to complete his task. The other section exhibits more originality, more independence and versatility, a certain poetic force and power of vivid representation. But that is not all. The Greek of the former part betrays throughout that it is a translation from a Hebrew original, perhaps of the third century B.C.—Ewald suggests the fourth—and reads like a piece of the  
LXX.;

LXX.; whereas in the latter the Greek is more like that of an original composition, being purer, more flowing, more choice in words and phrases, and not having a single trustworthy stamp upon it of being translated from a Hebrew text. Besides these two differences, there is, as Dr. Gifford has pointed out, a remarkable diversity between the two sections of the book in the words used to represent the sacred name of Jehovah. Now, from a critical point of view, these peculiarities invest the book with a considerable interest. It has come down to us under a single name, as a holograph, and there is not a shred of external evidence against its unity. Yet from internal and subjective considerations alone, even the most conservative critics are compelled to break it up, and assign the fragments to different authors. There is no need to point out how this precedent bears on the legitimacy of investigations into the grounds on which the claim to unity of other books in the Bible rests, when the internal evidence appears to be at variance with the popular tradition of their authorship.

Another point of interest arises from the similarity, too close to be accidental, between Baruch's prayer, and Daniel's (ix. 7-19). Which is the original, Baruch's as Ewald says, or Daniel's as Dr. Pusey maintains; or are both drawn from some earlier source? Here the burning questions about the unity and date of Daniel come to the front, and they are far too intricate, not to say dangerous, for us to meddle with. All we can venture to point out is this; that *if* the book of Daniel be a holograph, and *if* the features of the resemblance make it seem likely that Baruch is the quoter rather than the quoted, then Daniel must certainly be older than modern criticism generally allows it to be. But, on the other side, it will be urged that there is much virtue in a single *if*, and still more in two combined.

One more remark, and this time it is to point a warning to expositors. At the close of the praise of Wisdom, personified as female, there is a verse which stands thus in the authorized version, 'Afterward did he show himself upon earth, and conversed with men' (iii. 37), the immediate antecedent being apparently God. Upon this verse, as a heaven-provided weapon of controversy, the Fathers both Greek and Latin, apologists, expositors, and homilists, have eagerly laid hold, and strenuously brandished it in the face of Jews, Arians, and the whole crew of unbelievers and heretics, as a signal prophecy of the Incarnation, an unanswerable testimony that in Christ God Himself was made flesh, and tabernacled with men. Now Dr. Gifford, looking at the passage with the eyes of common sense,

sense, sees that this 'hyper-orthodox interpretation' is untenable, and that what is really intended is the abiding, progressive revelation of divine wisdom or truth to Israel in the Past. Accordingly he translates, 'Afterward *she* was seen upon earth;' and compares the sentiment with what Wisdom says of herself in Prov. viii. 31;—'Rejoicing in His habitable earth, and my delight was with the sons of men.' This correction, by a critic who cannot be suspected of indifference to orthodoxy, of the almost universal misuse of the passage, deserves particular attention, because the habit here exemplified—of extracting from texts, in the interests of theology, meanings that are alien from them, and cannot bear a moment's impartial investigation—has been in the past, and in many quarters still continues to be, the opprobrium of sacred exegesis, and a most fruitful source of error. Nothing more obscures the method and order of God's revelation of Himself to mankind, and makes a confused medley of the sacred literature which unfolds it. No book but the Bible is so mal-treated; and in no other case would it be possible to do the thousandth part of the mischief which has been the result of the mal-treatment.

Nothing now remains to be noticed, except the handling by Canon Rawlinson of the two books of the Maccabees. Here at last we are in the region of genuine History, but with a difference. The former book, almost certainly written in Hebrew, bears on its face the tokens of an original and sober narrative, in which the writer is evidently anxious to tell the unvarnished truth so far as he knows it; whereas the latter is history viewed through the eyes of a religious enthusiast, who abridges some earlier Greek work by an unknown author, Jason by name, presses into his service every legendary portent that he can lay hold of, and works up his subject into a sort of 'Pharisaic festival-book,' intended to win back the Jewish Colony in Egypt to the temple-worship at Jerusalem. The two books agree in having Judas, the Maccabee or Hammer, for their hero; but while the later book limits itself to his exploits, and ends with the decisive defeat inflicted by him on Nicanor; the older carries down the story to the death of Simon, the third of the three heroic brothers who in turn were leaders of Israel, and the succession in his room of his son, John Hyrcanus, as Prince and High Priest. The most marked differences in the characteristics of the two writers are well summed up by Canon Rawlinson in the following passage:—

'The writer of the First Book is reticent to excess on matters of religion, and especially chary of mentioning the Divine name, if he can anyhow avoid it. The writer of the Second Book is wholly  
Vol. 166.—No. 332.                      x                      devoid



devoid of any such scruple; he openly declares his religious views and feelings on all suitable occasions, and freely uses the words "God" and "Lord" whenever his subject-matter leads him to refer to the Supreme Being. Again, the writer of the First Book abstains from introducing into his narrative any account of recent miraculous occurrences—he is either not aware that miracles were believed to have been wrought during the course of the Syro-Macedonian struggle, or, if he knows the stories, he disbelieves them. In the Second Book, on the contrary, the miraculous element is a main feature; and though no doubt the writer was following his authority, Jason, when he gave it a place in his narrative, yet his elaboration of his stories, and the length at which he dwells on them, are a sufficient indication that he accepted their truth, and regarded them among the most important events of his history. Further, the writer of the First Book is careful not to assume the rôle of a religious teacher; he withholds all observations on the history which he relates, and leaves the events themselves to make their own impression. The writer of the Second Book acts in an exactly opposite manner. He is pointedly didactic and admonitory. Sometimes he formally addresses religious exhortations to his readers; more usually he appends his observations on the events as if they were forced from him by the strength of his own feelings, and were not intended as admonitions. The result is that the religious aspect of the history is kept continually before the reader's mind, who is taught on every page that impiety and blasphemy receive signal punishment at God's hands; that prayer is heard; that God fights openly on the side of His saints and delivers them; that if He suffers them to be afflicted, it is for the purpose of chastening and purifying them; and that, even if they suffer the worst that can happen to man in this life, they will be rewarded in the Resurrection.

To deal with any textual criticisms upon these histories is impracticable in the fragment of space that remains to us. All that we can remark is, that as we owe to them almost all our knowledge about the Maccabean wars, so it is from them that we obtain a true notion of the vital importance to Israel, of the struggle which ended in raising it to a higher degree of independence than it had enjoyed since the fall of the Davidian monarchy. The attempt of Antiochus, surnamed both Epiphanes, the Brilliant, and Epimanes, the Madman, to Hellenize Palestine by crushing out the Jewish faith, and substituting for it the gross, sensual Paganism of Syria, was but part of his scheme for consolidating an Eastern empire which should check the advance of the newly-risen empire of the West, and confine the Roman rule to Europe. True to his mixed and unscrupulous character, the audacious Seleucid monarch stuck at no enormities to accomplish his purpose. To proscribe the Mosaic rites, and turn the observance of them into a capital crime; to defile

defile the temple with idols, and the sacred books with swine's blood; to transform the holy city into a Greek garrison-town, and sweep away the righteousness of the Law by pouring over the land a torrent of Syrian superstition and voluptuousness—such was the process by which this 'vile person,' as he is styled in the visions of Daniel, adventured to gratify his ambition, though at the cost of deluging with innocent blood the fair inheritance of the people of Jehovah. Humanly speaking, the fate of Israel and the world trembled in the balance; and nothing could have averted the catastrophe but the stubborn, unconquerable temper of the remnant, in whose souls once more burned brightly the faith and valour which of old had conquered Palestine, and built up the empire of Solomon.

It is remarkable, as Dean Stanley observes, that greater posthumous honour has been shown to the noble deliverer of Israel from Syrian tyranny by Christian historians and divines, than by his own countrymen. It was to the great Judas that Handel turned for his hero, when he composed his Oratorio in honour of the Duke of Cumberland's return in triumph from Culloden in 1746, and gave to the world the immortal strain, 'See the conquering hero comes.' Whether the explanation is satisfactory, that the 'Hammer' who smote down the pride of Syria had too much of the ancient Greek mettle about him to please the Rabbis, we are scarcely prepared to say.

Before we lay down the pen, we have a pleasant duty to discharge. It will have been observed that hitherto all our references have been to the work of the Editor's lieutenants; of his own work, the work of their commander-in-chief, nothing has come before us. Owing to the self-denying ordinance laid down by him for himself, to abstain from taking in hand any of the Apocryphal books, he nowhere appears except in the few lines with which the volumes are prefaced. It must not be inferred that his office has been a sinecure, or his task a light one. In such undertakings as the one before us, the function of the Editor, if we may venture to employ a very homely but expressive illustration, may be compared to that of the 'onion's atoms' in the salad, which, according to Sydney Smith's well-known recipe,

'lurk within the bowl,  
And, scarce suspected, animate the whole.'

Subterranean work is not the less real for being out of sight. To plan the outline, and allocate the several parts: to harmonize divergencies, curtail redundancies, suggest topics which have been omitted, and reduce the various contributions to a

compact and complete Commentary, which shall be at one with itself and up to the level of modern knowledge; are tasks which are not to be achieved by the hand of a dilettante trifler. In saying this, we cannot forget how much students of the development of Christianity owe to Dr. Wace besides, for the decade of toil which he has spent, in conjunction with Dr. William Smith, in guiding the progress of that great enterprise, now happily concluded, the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography.' Upon him, as we have good reason for knowing, the chief burden has rested of bringing this long-desired work to a successful conclusion. To superintend at the same time the execution of both works must have entailed unusual strain and labour, which call for a period of repose; we only hope, in the interest of the public, that the well-earned rest will not be unnecessarily prolonged.

ART. II.—1. *Keats*. By Sidney Colvin. London, 1887.

2. *Life of John Keats*. By William Michael Rossetti. London, 1887.

UNDER the date of April 1818, a criticism of Keats's *Endymion* appeared in these pages, which has proved the nucleus of a widely-accepted literary myth. Thousands who have never read the review in question derive the impression from *Adonais* or *Don Juan*, that it contains a savage and grossly personal attack upon Keats; that the criticism was inspired by a bitter spirit of political partizanship; and that its cruel injustice not only discouraged him from completing *Hyperion*, but was the principal cause of the poet's untimely death. From the same poetical source springs the equally false impression, that Keats was nothing but an effeminate, sentimental, enervated weakling, who deserved the contempt of Byron almost more than the generous pity of Shelley. Both impressions are indisputably hasty; they are also erroneous and unfounded. To this subject we shall return after a brief sketch of Keats's career. But it may be said, at the outset, that there is little, or nothing, of the adverse criticism contained in that famous review, which we desire to withdraw even after the lapse of seventy years.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the charges that are justly directed against the cold formalism of eighteenth-century poetry. They have already passed into commonplaces of literary criticism. In lines which are too familiar for quotation, Keats himself

himself gave the most vigorous expression to the revolutionary spirit of poetical emancipation, and to the frigid mechanical art against which it rebelled. Poets of the new school desired to return to nature from academic conventionality, to replace the skill of a poetical handicraftsman by the racy freedom of Elizabethan writers. But many of the reformers, like the Calvinist in the 'Tale of the Tub,' who inherited from his ancestors a gold-embroidered coat, in their eagerness to strip off the frippery, destroyed the cloth. Taste and reason had hitherto ruled with absolute supremacy; imagination, depth of feeling, variety of music, intensity of sentiment for nature, had been long subordinated to satire, pithy sayings, moral teaching, and didactic wit. Now the dethroned despots of the past generation were unduly neglected and despised. It was Keats's misfortune, so far as his immediate popularity was concerned, that he was born two centuries too late or half a century too soon, and that he sang to a generation which but dimly understood his appeals to deeper feelings than those on which Scott and Byron so successfully played. The spell, which the two last-mentioned poets laid upon their contemporaries, was strong in virtue of its extreme simplicity. They abandoned the moralizing tone of their predecessors, yet retained their close touch with humanity. Man was the great subject on which their genius was employed. They sought no epics in nests or tragedies in tattered cloaks; they did not subordinate human action to the viewless agencies of Nature; her forms were but the occasional delights, the accidental graces which served to embellish the central figure, man. This close touch with humanity was the common characteristic of two widely different writers. If Byron was often disordered in his passion and diseased in his sublimity, he makes us feel that we are dealing not with shadows but with living men. The same power belongs to Scott. He sweeps us back to stirring times of old, when honour and self-devotion were active forces, when patriotism and loyalty were working principles, when brave hearts declared themselves in deeds of chivalrous daring. He gave the nation what it ever needs,—a poet who elevates our souls by the delineation of generous and lofty natures painted from the visions of his own kindred brain.

But Scott and Byron were the representatives, not the leaders, of their generation, and their influence departed with the temporary conditions upon which it depended. The spirit of the age in which we live is inspired by Wordsworth and by Keats; they, and not their admired contemporaries, directed the tendencies of the future. Modern poetry is in the main either critical or literary. Some poets are, like Lord Tennyson, equally

equally compounded of the subjective philosopher and the objective artist; others belong exclusively to one or other of the rival schools, either analyzing Man and investigating Nature, or creating dreams of beauty which surfeit the mind with dainties rather than feed it with robust manliness of sentiment. When Keats wrote, the ideal which he presented, though really a revival, was regarded as a new birth, and it was condemned as vapid and effeminate. He lived too short a time to found a school; his poetry clashed with the feeling of the day, and he paid the almost inevitable penalty of contemporary ostracism.

John Keats was born on the 31st of October, 1795. The caprice of genius is strikingly exemplified in his parentage. His maternal grandfather was John Jennings, the proprietor of a livery stable in Lower Moorfields, whose daughter, Frances, married the head stableman, Thomas Keats. She was left a widow in 1804 with three sons and a daughter. Of these children John Keats was the eldest. The name Jennings is common in Wales, and Thomas Keats came from the West country, and possibly from Cornwall. The keen feeling for beauty, the intuitive sympathy with all the operations of nature which so strongly characterized his poetry from the very first, are the birthright of the Celtic race from which the poet probably sprang; but though the rich unconscious love of nature may be thus explained, the Greek instinct for combining human and natural beauty, for giving concrete shape and personality to all the powers which made up the joyous plenitude of life around him, could not have been acquired by inheritance from Welsh or English parentage.

The three brothers were sent to a well-known boarding-school at Enfield, kept by the father of Cowden Clarke. There John Keats was chiefly distinguished for 'terrier courage,' daring pugnacity, animal spirits, and vehemence of temper. He was not studious, or exceptionally brilliant in intellect; but before he left school he showed that he possessed extraordinary powers of concentration, industry, and perseverance, which enabled him to win all the prizes for literature. These were the traits of character which were most conspicuous in the boy. But a very different impression of him had been formed during the thirty years which intervened between his death and the publication of Lord Houghton's Memoirs. 'Johnny Keats' was commonly regarded as a pining, fragile, lack-a-daisical, sentimental youth, deficient in manly sense, manly purpose, and the best elements of greatness. This misinterpretation was strongly confirmed by the fantastic effeminacy of his early poetry, by  
the

the impression created through *Adonais* and *Don Juan*, and by the ill-judged sympathy of his friends, who represented him as made of the stuff which weakly succumbs to adverse criticism. In manhood Keats was what his boyhood leads us to expect, unselfish, warmly sympathetic, proud, vehement, generous, incapable of meanness, full of common-sense and self-knowledge, distinguished as well for moral as for physical courage. But even as a child he was always in extremes, passing rapidly from passions of tears to convulsions of laughter; and, as his brother George notices, a self-tormenting melancholy, an almost savage despondency, and a deep morbidity of temperament underlay his bright, spirited, and vivacious exterior. In this passionate sensibility we recognize the effusive sentiment of his early poetry and of *Endymion*, and by the fretful tendency to magnify and exasperate his troubles we are prepared for the unmanly wailings of his letters to Fanny Brawne.

In 1810 Keats's mother died of consumption. She was devotedly nursed by her eldest son, who loved her with all the warmth, and mourned her with all the intensity, of his deeply susceptible nature. Her four children were not penniless. Each of them was entitled to about 2000*l.*, invested in the hands of trustees. But his guardian at once withdrew John Keats from school, and apprenticed him to a surgeon at Edmonton. There he pursued his literary studies with increased eagerness. He finished a prose translation of Virgil's '*Æneid*,' which he had commenced at school, and devoured all the works of travel, history, or fiction to which he could obtain access. His favourite reading up to this time was mythology; he almost knew by heart Tooke's '*Pantheon*,' Spence's '*Polymetis*,' and Lemprière's '*Classical Dictionary*.' Of Greek he was totally ignorant, for it was not included among the subjects taught at Enfield. The fact is of great importance, because it helps to explain the peculiarities in his treatment of classic myths. In one sense his ignorance of the language proved a gain. He escaped the danger of commonplace, second-hand scholarship; he never thought of imitating; he was not critical; he had no craving for correctness. He worships with boyish enthusiasm, yet with something of the mystic fire of the North, at the feet of the faded hierarchy of Olympus. But when it is said that he breathed new life into classic mythology, we join issue with his admirers. Keats did indeed look upon the world of nature with the eyes of a Greek; and what he did, was to strip the ancient Gods and Goddesses of the pedantic formalities of literary poetasters, to make them personal embodiments of his own impressions, to give them the vitality of flesh and blood,

to

to transform them from abstractions into living creatures. But when the spirit which he infused into them was not imitative of Gothic writers, it was essentially modern, and the figures are neither Greek nor human.

Keats's poetic gifts were slow to assert themselves, and were long unsuspected even by himself. There was nothing precocious in their development. Born to be a poet, he remained till his eighteenth year ignorant of his birthright. A poet's accession to his inheritance is in no other instance so distinctly recorded. Edmonton lies within easy reach of Enfield, and Keats frequently walked over to his old school to borrow books from Charles Cowden Clarke. One afternoon in 1813 Clarke read him Spenser's *Epithalamium*, and he returned that evening to Edmonton with a copy of *The Faery Queene*. It may be noticed that Mr. Rossetti (p. 19) ignores Clarke's account of Keats's first introduction to Spenser, giving the impression that the desire to read *The Faery Queene* originated with the future poet himself. Clarke's account is explicit, and has never been discredited. He adds that if Keats had not shown a taste for poetry, he would scarcely have read the *Epithalamium* to so young a lad. Spenser's treasure-house of fancy is inexhaustibly rich in poetic materials; he is, as Clough said, the poet's poet. His *Faery Queene* enthralled, fascinated, and absorbed Keats. From that moment Poetry rapt him to 'her realms of gold.' 'He ramped through the scenes of the romance,' says Clarke, 'like a young horse turned into a spring meadow.' He learnt the stanzas by heart, read them aloud or discussed them with his friend, fell into ecstasies of delight at the picture-making epithets, brooded over the quaint archaisms with the persistency of a lover, and revelled in the varied luxury of the rich poetic fancies of the Elizabethan poet. Spenser, in fact, decided Keats's future. Secretly and shyly he began to imitate the stanzas of his model, to compose sonnets, and to write occasional verses. But it was not till 1815, when he was in his twenty-first year, that he ventured to show any of his own compositions even to his most intimate friend, Cowden Clarke. The piece was a sonnet upon Leigh Hunt, who in February 1815 was released from his two years' imprisonment for a libel upon the Prince Regent.

In spite of his literary enthusiasm, Keats had hitherto steadily pursued his medical studies. In 1814 he left Edmonton to walk the hospitals of St. Thomas's and Guy's. In 1815 he passed with credit his medical examination as licentiate at Apothecaries' Hall, was appointed a dresser at Guy's, and even performed an operation with dexterity. But it gradually became  
evident



evident to him that he had missed his vocation. His heart was not in his profession. He was oppressed by a sense of its responsibilities. Above all, he had come to regard Poetry as 'the zenith of all his aspirations'—the only pursuit which was not tame and mean. He scribbled doggerel rhymes among his medical notes; and if, during the lectures, a sunbeam streamed into the room, there came 'with it a whole troop of creatures floating in the ray; and I was off with them to Oberon and Fairy land.' Towards the end of 1816, or the beginning of 1817, when he was in his twenty-second year and was no longer subject to the control of his guardian, he seems to have definitely decided to abandon medicine for literature. In this decision he was greatly influenced by his growing intimacy with literary men, by the publication in the *Examiner* of his sonnets on *Solitude* and *Chapman's Homer*, and by the praise which he had received in the same paper from Leigh Hunt.\*

'*Noscitur e sociis*'; and the saying is true, whether the friends are books or men. At this crisis of Keats's career, on the eve of his short literary life, it may be of interest to note his favourite authors and most intimate associates. The course of his reading during the years 1813-6 can be traced in his earliest volume of poetry. Since his arrival in London he had experienced the second great impulse of his mental development, and once more through the agency of Cowden Clarke. Together they had read a borrowed copy of Chapman's 'Homer,' from early evening till long past daybreak. In the morning, Clarke found on his table the famous sonnet *On First Looking into Chapman's Homer*. Besides Spenser and Chapman, Keats numbered among his favourite poets, Chaucer, Browne, Drayton, and Fletcher. He also delighted in the minor poems of Shakspeare and Milton. But though much of his language and his prosody is Elizabethan; though his use of words, his iteration of repeated vowel sounds, and the easy flow of his versification, betray the influence of Spenser; and though his introduction of short lines in the midst of heroics reminds us of Lycidas, he was in 1816 mainly governed by eighteenth-century or contemporary writers. He had not yet framed for himself the peculiar vocabulary appropriate to his poetic Utopias, but his language retains the artificiality and stiffness of the previous century; his references to classic mythology are hardly less trite and conventional than those of Hayley; the moralizing tone of the successors of Pope

\* In the *Examiner* for December 1816, Keats, Shelley, and Reynolds, are classed together as three young writers who 'promise a considerable addition of strength to the new school' of poetry.

appears conspicuously in his *Epistles*; the personified abstractions suggest the hand of Gray; the lines written *In Imitation of Spenser* recal Thomson rather than their avowed model. His *Lines to some Young Ladies*, and *On Receiving a Shell*, contain a feeble and entirely unsuccessful attempt to catch the lilt of Moore's versification. Allusions to Mrs. Tighe's *Psyche* and Wordsworth, and sonnets to Chatterton and Byron, show that these were among the recent or living authors whom he most admired. But his worship was reserved for Leigh Hunt, who directed him to the study of Elizabethan literature, but who also exercised an influence which is disastrously conspicuous in Keats's errors of taste, affectations, false rhymes, and faults of diction. Phrases such as these are in the worst style of the 'Cockney School': 'jaunty brooks,' 'the million poutings of the brine,' 'the trees that lean . . . so elegantly o'er the water's brim,' or the couplet quoted by Mr. Colvin:—

‘The lamps that from the high roof'd wall were pendent,  
And gave the steel a shining quite transcendent.’

Leigh Hunt was at this time the centre of a literary coterie which made Hampstead its headquarters, and to which Keats was introduced by Cowden Clarke. He was the editor, and his brother John the publisher, of a Sunday paper called the *Examiner*, which had been started in 1808, and was 'named after the *Examiner* of Swift and his brother Tories.' Keats had conceived a boy's enthusiasm for Hunt, who was the most appreciative of critics, and the most attractive of fireside companions. The *Examiner* was taken in at Enfield School, and dictated his youthful politics; the first poetical composition, which he showed to a friend, was the sonnet on Hunt's release from prison; he christened Hunt 'Libertas,' and allusions to 'lov'd Libertas' are common in his early poetry. The literary influence which Hunt exercised over his contemporaries was wholly disproportionate to his ability. As a poetical reformer in versification he aimed at greater flexibility in the management of the heroic couplet, and in style at a freer cast of language. Believing Dryden to be the last English poet who used rhyming decasyllables with ease and variety, he took him as his model. He set his face against monotony of accent, or mechanical coincidences between metrical divisions and the structure of sentences. In language he strove to displace the artificial restraints and stilted grandiloquence of the followers of Pope by a colloquial, idiomatic diction. Men of high breeding and fastidious taste in the careless intercourse of genial friendship drop naturally into the use of pure and simple English; but  
Hunt

Hunt forgot that the conversational tone of ill-trained, underbred persons, who assume the vivacious ease of intimacy, degenerates into pert familiarity, and affected jauntiness. Sharing as Hunt did Keats's views upon prosody and his love for Spenser, he rapidly gained an ascendancy over the youthful poet. His own poetic inspiration was principally drawn from Italian literature. *Il Parnaso Italiano*, in fifty-six duodecimo volumes, was the 'sunshine' of his imprisonment; and it was probably under his guidance that Keats turned to Tasso and Boccaccio. Hunt's bright and airy fancy, his descriptive powers, his minutely observed and vividly painted vignettes from nature, gave his writings a strong attraction for Keats. But in many respects no other influence could have been worse. Hunt's affectations, mannerisms, and poetical foppery, his fantastic epithets and provoking conceits, his irrepressible tendency to effusive enthusiasm over the 'deliciousness' of nature, made him a dangerous companion to an ill-trained and impressionable youth.

Keats at once became a welcome visitor at Hunt's cottage in the Vale of Health, and there he wrote *Sleep and Poetry*, which, biographically, is the most interesting of his early poems. The friendship between the two men was sincere, though its display was often affectedly ridiculous. When we hear of nineteenth-century poets presenting one another with floral wreaths, we cannot resist the conviction, that for Keats the atmosphere of Hunt's cottage was little short of deadly. Fortunately for himself, Keats possessed insight enough to recognize Hunt's many weaknesses, and sufficient strength of character to hold independent views. Hunt continued to be a kind and valued friend; but intellectually they diverged so widely apart, that in 1818 Keats wrote: 'Hunt has damned Hampstead and masks and sonnets and Italian tales.' Through Hunt, Keats was introduced to the public, and to men like Charles Lamb, Hazlitt, Shelley and Haydon. With Lamb and Hazlitt Keats never became intimate. Nor were he and Shelley close friends, mainly because, as both Hunt and Haydon agree, Keats was sensitive on the score of his origin, and inclined 'to see in every man of birth a sort of natural enemy.' Between Haydon and Keats the friendship seemed almost too passionate to last, yet it continued till 1820. Haydon's best title to the remembrance of posterity is the acquisition of the Elgin Marbles, and no doubt Keats derived from him some portion of his own rare insight into the spirit and the life of Greek art.

Outside the circle which clustered round Hunt, Keats's most intimate friend was John Hamilton Reynolds, like himself at  
this

this time an aspirant to poetic fame.\* Though a year younger than Keats, Reynolds had already published a poem called *Safie*, written in the Oriental and Byronian style. He became Keats's most intimate friend and correspondent. Not content with interchanging their verses, they had apparently projected a joint volume of verse. In 1821 Reynolds published *The Garden of Florence* and other Poems. In the Preface he thus alludes to the author of *Isabella, or the Pot of Basil*:—

‘The stories from Boccaccio (*The Garden of Florence* and the *Ladye of Provence*) were to have been associated with tales from the same source, intended to have been written by a friend; but illness on his part and distracting engagements on mine, prevented us from accomplishing our plan at the time; and Death now, to my deep sorrow, has frustrated it for ever.

‘He, who is gone, was one of the kindest friends I possessed. His intense mind and powerful feeling could, I truly believe, have done the world some service had his life been spared—but he was of too sensitive a nature, and thus he was destroyed. One story he completed, and that is to me the most pathetic poem in existence.’

Besides these prefatory allusions it seems to us probable that Keats is partly the hero of the longest poem in the volume, ‘*The Romance of Youth*.’ The youth is described as one, who

‘read and dreamt of young Endymion,  
Till his romantic fancy drank its fill;  
He saw that lovely shepherd sitting alone,  
Watching his white flocks upon Ida’s hill,’ &c.

Through Reynolds, Keats made the acquaintance of Bailey, afterwards Archdeacon of Colombo, with whom he spent some weeks at Oxford in 1817. Severn the artist, in whose arms he afterwards died, was a friend of his brother George. To his brothers also he owed his introduction to Charles Armitage Brown, a retired Russian merchant, considerably older than himself, the Mæcenas of his literary career, the companion of his walking tour in Scotland, his fellow-lodger in Hampstead, and his collaborateur in *Otho the Great*. By his intimacy with Brown he became acquainted with Dilke, and it was at the Dilkes’ that he first met Fanny Brawne.

The list of Keats’s friends might be easily extended. Both to the eye and the mind he was a singularly attractive lad. In figure he was almost dwarfish, and the great breadth of his shoulders deprived him in appearance of some of the few inches that he possessed. His head was, like Shelley’s, remarkably

\* Mr. Rossetti, it may be noticed, confuses J. H. Reynolds with Frederick Mansel Reynolds, the author of *Miserrimus* (p. 22).

small. His face was rather long, his forehead broad and massive, his features strongly yet clearly cut, at once powerful and finished. His mouth was bad, but its combative expression was redeemed by its sensitiveness. His eyes were a deep hazel-brown, large, soft, and expressive, glowing with a consciousness of his poetic calling. His hair, which was curling and abundant, was of a golden red. Among congenial companions and in a social mood, 'Junkets,' as he was nicknamed, was a gay, high-spirited, brilliant companion; an excellent, but never unkindly, mimic, and gifted with that histrionic talent which is essential for good talkers. Eager, animated, enthusiastic, he threw himself with low-voiced ardour into any subject which interested him. His moral courage was strongly marked; and his earnestness gave a rare impressiveness to his reproof of calumny and slander.

With these personal advantages, and with these associates among books and men, Keats commenced a literary career which barely lasted three years. We propose to sketch it in the briefest possible outline. It could not be better or more succinctly told than it is in Mr. Colvin's admirable volume.

Keats's first volume of poetry was published in March 1817, and shortly afterwards he left London to write a 'long poem.' He looked upon the attempt as a test of his powers of imagination and invention. 'I must,' he writes, 'make 4000 lines of one bare circumstance and fill them with poetry.' The hope with which he thus commenced *Endymion* was almost literally fulfilled:—

'O may no wintry season, bare and hoary,  
See it half finished; but let Autumn bold,  
With universal tinge of sober gold,  
Be all about me when I make an end.'

The rough draft of the poem was completed at Burford Bridge, on the 28th of November, 1817. For the next few weeks Keats was occupied, either at Hampstead or Teignmouth, in seeing *Endymion* through the press. It was published in April 1818.

During the period which intervened between the completion and the publication of *Endymion* two new influences occupied his mind. The first was Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which produced *Hyperion*; the second was the *Decameron* of Boccaccio, which inspired *Isabella, or the Pot of Basil*. Up to this time he seems to have had no taste for Milton's great epic, although he had read and re-read *Lycidas*, *Comus*, the *Penseroso* and the *Allegro*. Now, however, as his mind gathered increased strength, he turned to the *Paradise Lost*, and feasted upon it with the appreciative taste of a brother poet. Apart from the variety  
and

and interest of its subject, the *Decameron* exercised over him a charm which is easily understood. Boccaccio, like Keats himself, was an artist in language. He does not treat words as passive instruments over which he can tyrannize at will; but he regards them as instinct with life and beauty, and he courts them with the tender devotion of an ardent lover. *Isabella* is the first highly-finished work which Keats had composed, and it was completed in the same month which saw the publication of *Endymion*.

In June 1818 George Keats married Georgiana Wylie, and emigrated to America. Keats, accompanied by Brown, saw them off from Liverpool. Thence the two friends started on a walking tour of several weeks through the Lakes and Scotland. Over-fatigued by his exertions, ill-fed, badly lodged, and often drenched to the skin, Keats broke down in the middle of August. The first signs of his hereditary disease showed themselves in feverish symptoms and a sore throat, which he never again shook off. He returned alone to London to find his youngest brother dying, like his mother, of decline. In December 'Poor Tom' died after a long, distressing illness, through which he was tenderly nursed by his brother, and Keats went to live with Brown in Hampstead, bringing with him the unfinished *Hyperion*.

During Brown's absence in Scotland, his house was let to a Mrs. Brawne, a widow lady with a grown-up daughter, and she naturally became intimate with the Dilkes, who occupied the adjoining semi-detached house. At the Dilkes', Keats first met Miss Fanny Brawne. 'Ut vidi! Ut perii!' Within a week of their meeting he wrote himself her vassal. In a letter to his friend Bailey, written five months before, he had expressed his disinclination for female society. 'Among women,' he says, 'I have evil thoughts, malice, spleen. I cannot speak, or be silent; I am full of suspicions, and therefore listen to nothing; I am in a hurry to be gone.' To this feeling the sense of his almost dwarfish height no doubt contributed. 'After all,' he adds, 'I do think better of womankind than to suppose they care whether Mister John Keats, five feet high, likes them or not.' Miss Brawne liked him, as he believed, for himself, and not for his poetry; and this was one of her strongest attractions for him. He sends his brother George a sketch of the girl who was destined to exercise so fatal an influence over his life:—

'Shall I give you Miss Brawne? She is about my height, with a fine style of countenance of the lengthened sort. She wants sentiment in every feature. She manages to make her hair look well; her nostrils are very fine, though a little painful; her mouth is bad,  
and

and good; her profile is better than her full face, which is indeed not "full," but pale and thin, without showing any bone; her shape is very graceful, and so are her movements; her arms are good, her hands bad-ish, her feet tolerable.'

The silhouette which has been preserved of Fanny Brawne gives her a sloping forehead, aquiline nose, a rather pretty mouth, a profusion of hair, and a slight graceful figure. Keats's letter to his brother, written almost immediately after their first meeting, discusses her claims to beauty satirically, if not sarcastically. Yet, writing later to Miss Brawne herself, he says: 'I cannot conceive any beginning of such love as I have for you but beauty;' or again: 'All I can bring you is a swooning admiration of your Beauty.' Her ways, manners, and appearance alternately attracted and repelled him, and in the end completely enthralled and fascinated his thoughts. His passion blazed up suddenly into a fierce flame, which consumed his soul and body; it would perhaps have been better for him if his love had been rejected. The lovers met daily, and took long walks together. Mrs. Brawne was powerless to prevent their engagement; and, as Dilke wrote, 'it was soon 'quite a settled thing between John Keats and Miss Brawne.'

At first his new passion seemed to add fuel to the fire of his poetic energy. He wrote with unparalleled freedom. The early months of 1819 were extraordinarily rich in poetic achievement. He completed *The Eve of St. Agnes*, continued *Hyperion*, and wrote the Odes *To Psyche*, *On a Grecian Urn*, *On Indolence*, and *To a Nightingale*. But gradually, as he began to realize his position, his happiness fled. Alone in the world, and deprived by the departure of his brother George of the only friend to whom he had vented his morbid fits of despondency; weakened in constitution by his exertions in Scotland, and by the unfortunate results of some youthful dissipations; already struggling against the first advance of an inexorable disease; depressed by the death of his brother; distracted by pecuniary difficulties; dispirited by the depreciation of his poetry; darkened by the shadow of impending poverty; despairing, though betrothed, of marriage in the immediate or even the distant future; tormented by brooding doubts of Miss Brawne's affection, he had not the physical constitution to bear the strain. His morbid temperament hourly increased the tension. He hoped that in the country, away from Hampstead and out of sight of his love, he might regain his strength and his composure. In July 1819 he left London for Shanklin. There *Lamia* and *Otho the Great* were begun. The latter piece was intended for the stage, and it was hoped



hoped that Kean might play Ludolph. On the score of his operatic success Brown was entrusted with the plot and its construction, while Keats filled in his outline. From Shanklin he moved to Winchester, where he finished *Lamia*, wrote the *Ode to Autumn*, began *King Stephen*, and decided to abandon *Hyperion*.

In October he so far recovered, that he moved into lodgings in Westminster. But he could not refrain from visiting Miss Brawne. Moth-like, he fluttered round the flame and was consumed. The health and the tranquillity, which he thought he had gained in the country, once more broke down as soon as he returned to Hampstead. 'Of the triple flame,' writes Mr. Colvin, 'which was burning away his life, the flame of genius, of passion, and of disease, whilst the last kept smouldering in secret, the second burnt every day more fiercely, and the first began from this time forth to sink.' By October 1819, his literary life had practically closed. In his misery he lost all dignity and self-control; he became discontented, abstracted, moody, unquiet, reckless, finding for a brief space his only solace in laudanum. His poetical powers rapidly waned. He occupied his mornings in writing the most worthless of all his poetry, the satirical fairy story of the *Cap and Bells*. His evenings he spent in an attempt to remodel *Hyperion* into the form of a vision. Such alterations as he made in the original poem were uniformly for the worse; but the newly added vision is in itself remarkably impressive. It also possesses a most pathetic interest. In his first volume of poems, Keats had poured forth the one ambition, the overmastering passion of his heart.

'O for ten years, that I may overwhelm  
Myself in poesy! so I may do the deed  
That my own soul has to itself decreed.'

He had sung of the tones that only reach the poet's ear, the golden halls and glorious festivals that open only to the poet's eye;

'These are the living pleasures of the bard;  
But richer far posterity's award.  
What does he murmur with his latest breath,  
While his proud eye looks through the film of death?  
What though I leave this dull and earthly mould,  
Yet shall my spirit lofty converse hold  
With after times.'

His letters illustrate the extent to which he had been seized and possessed by the passion for Poetry, and the hope of poetic fame. In 1817, he had written:—

'I

'I find I cannot exist without Poetry—without eternal Poetry ; half the day will not do—the whole of it.'

Or again :

'I have asked myself why I should be a poet more than other men, seeing how great a thing it is,—how great things are to be gained by it, what a thing to be in the mouth of Fame,—that at last the idea has grown so monstrously beyond my seeming power of attainment, that the other day I nearly consented with myself to drop into a Phaeton. Yet 'tis a disgrace to fail, even in a huge attempt; and at this moment I drive the thought from me.'

Or again :

'I am one that "gathers samphire, dreadful trade"—the cliff of Poesy towers above me—yet when Tom who meets with some of Pope's Homer in Plutarch's Lives reads some of those to me, they seem like Mice to mine.'

Three years had barely ended, and all was changed. Now when the priestess of Saturn's temple summons him to mount the stair to her side, he all but expires in the effort. And (in words that tell the secret of his bitter despondency) she explains to him that the lot of the poet is harder far than that of common men who labour for mortal good in less ambitious fields.

'What benefit can'st thou do, or all thy tribe,  
To the great world? Thou art a dreaming thing,  
A fever of thyself; think of the earth;  
What bliss, even in hope, is there for thee?  
What haven? Every creature hath its home,  
Every sole man hath days of joy and pain,  
Whether his labours be sublime or low—  
The pain alone, the joy alone, distinct;  
Only the dreamer venoms all his days,  
Bearing more woe than all his sins deserve.'

It is hardly possible to conceive a more pathetic contrast than that which is presented between the youthful poet and lover of 1817:—

'Who stood on Latmus' top what time there blew  
Soft breezes from the myrtle vale below;  
And brought, in faintness solemn, sweet, and slow,  
A hymn from Dian's temple.'

and this embittered cry wrung from a heart self-tormented by its own brooding thoughts, and conscious of waning powers both of mind and body—

'Only the dreamer venoms all his days,  
Bearing more woe than all his sins deserve.'

Once poetry had soothed and tranquillized his spirit. Now it rather aggravated than calmed his restlessness. 'I may say,' he writes in 1820, 'that for six months before I had been taken ill I had not passed a tranquil day. Either that gloom overspread me, or I was suffering under some passionate feeling, or if I turned to versify, that acerbated the poison of either sensation.' The charm of his early verse had been the fresh delight in nature; 'the beauties of Nature had lost their power over me,' is now his sad confession. Only those who have lost the spring of their first ambition can appreciate the full pathos of the change.

Over many portions of the last twelve months of what he called his posthumous life the lovers of the man Keats would gladly draw the veil. Nervous, jealous, fretful, and half-frenzied with suspicion of Miss Brawne and all his friends, his constitution succumbed to the tension of the accumulated strain. On the 3rd of February, 1820, the first open sign of disease showed itself. Mr. Colvin quotes a passage from Brown's MS. which supplied the material to Lord Houghton. Keats returned home late at night, severely chilled by a winter's drive without a coat on the outside of the stage coach; and at Brown's suggestion at once went to bed.

'I entered his chamber as he leapt into bed. On entering the cold sheets, before his head was on the pillow, he slightly coughed, and I heard him say, "That is blood from my mouth." I went towards him: he was examining a single drop of blood upon the sheet. "Bring me the candle, Brown, and let me see this blood." After regarding it steadfastly, he looked up in my face, with a calmness of countenance that I can never forget, and said, "I know the colour of that blood;—it is arterial blood;—I cannot be deceived in that colour;—that drop of blood is my death-warrant;—I must die."'

His disease made rapid progress. As it advanced, he became completely unmanned, abandoned all self-restraint, and gave vent to his agony in a series of pitiful outcries. His letters to Fanny Brawne, filled with morbid suspicions of her conduct, and irritable expressions towards his friends, reveal the dis-tempered state of his mind:—

'Hamlet's heart,' he writes, 'was full of such misery as mine is, when he said to Ophelia, "Go to a nunnery, go, go!" Indeed, I should like to give up the matter at once—I should like to die. I am sickened at the brute world you are smiling with. I hate men and women. . . . The world is too brutal for me. I am glad there is such a thing as the grave—I am sure I shall never have any rest till I get there. At any rate, I will indulge myself by never seeing any more Dilke or Brown, or any of their friends.'

Such

Such was the whimpering tone of gloomy despair, fevered irritation, and morbid suspicion, with which Keats wrote to his betrothed as he lay under a sentence of death which he scarcely hoped to postpone by immediate expatriation. So great was the self-torture of his consuming passion, so completely shattered were his nerves, that he had practically ceased to be responsible for what he said or wrote.

In July 1820 he published his third and immortal volume of poetry. Its success or failure hardly seemed to interest him. Two months later he sailed for Naples, with Severn the painter as his companion. The *Maria Crowther* was detained by contrary winds in the Channel. At first the fresh sea-air appeared to soothe him to tranquillity, and on board the ship he wrote in a blank page of his folio copy of Shakspeare's poems, opposite the *Lover's Complaint*, his last piece of verse composition, and one of the most beautiful and best known of his sonnets:

'Bright star, would I were steadfast as thou art,  
Not in lone splendour hung aloft the night  
And watching, with eternal lids apart,  
Like Nature's patient, sleepless Eremite,  
The moving waters at their priestlike task  
Of cold ablution round earth's human shores,  
Or gazing on the new soft-fallen mask  
Of snow upon the mountains and the moors—  
No—yet still steadfast, yet unchangeable,  
Pillow'd upon my fair love's ripening breast,  
To feel for ever its soft fall and swell  
Awake for ever in a sweet unrest,  
Still, still to hear her tender-taken breath,  
And so live ever—or else swoon to death.'

Keats and Severn reached Naples towards the end of October 1820. On the 1st of November he writes to Brown a letter which makes it evident that, as he himself says:—

'If I had any chance of recovery this passion would kill me. I can bear to die—I cannot bear to leave her. Oh, God! God! God! Everything I have in my trunks that reminds me of her goes through me like a spear. The silk lining she put in my travelling-cap scalds my head. My imagination is horribly vivid about her—I see her—I hear her. There is nothing in the world of sufficient interest to divert me from her for a moment. This was the case when I was in England; I cannot recollect, without shuddering, the time that I was a prisoner at Hunt's, and used to keep my eyes fixed on Hampstead all day. Then there was a good hope of seeing her again. Now!—O that I could be buried near where she lives! I am afraid to write to her—to receive a letter from her—to see her handwriting would  
break

break my heart—even to hear of her anyhow, to see her name written, would be more than I can bear.'

In such a condition recovery was hopeless, and the end was not long delayed.

It is remarkable that Keats never confided to Severn the secret of his passion for Fanny Brawne. His letters to his betrothed were published in 1878, and Severn subsequently wrote to Mr. Forman, by whom they were edited,—

*'it now seems to me but for this cause he might have lived many (sic) years. I can now understand his want of courage to speak, as it was consuming him in body and mind. I left England with him with the confidence of his recovery, for so the doctors assured me, but in less than a year this fatal passion destroyed him.'*

Severn's letters from Rome touchingly chronicle the last days of Keats. On the 22nd of February, 1821, he writes:—

*'Last night I thought he was going; I could hear the phlegm in his throat: he bade me lift him up in the bed or he would die with pain. I watched him all night, expecting him to be suffocated at every cough. This morning, by the pale daylight, the change in him frightened me; he has sunk in the last three days to a most ghastly look.'*

On the 27th, Severn writes again;—

*'He is gone; he died with the most perfect ease—he seemed to go to sleep. On the twenty-third, about four, the approaches of death came on. "Severn—I—lift me up—I am dying—I shall die easy; don't be frightened—be firm, and thank God it has come." I lifted him up in my arms. The phlegm seemed boiling in his throat, and increased until eleven, when he gradually sank into death, so quiet, that I still thought he slept.'*

Keats lies buried in the Protestant cemetery at Rome, near the pyramid of Caius Cestius. On his tomb is the inscription which he desired Severn to place upon it, 'Here lies one whose name was writ in water.'

The most marked characteristic of Keats's poetical career is the rapid and continuous development of his powers. The following remarkable passage, which occurs in a letter written in 1818 to J. H. Reynolds, applies with autobiographical exactness to the growth of his own genius:—

*'I compare human life to a large mansion of many apartments, two of which only I can describe, the doors of the rest being as yet shut upon me. The first we step into we call the Infant, or Thoughtless Chamber, in which we remain as long as we do not think. We remain there a long while, and, notwithstanding the doors of the second chamber remain wide open, showing a bright appearance, we*

care

care not to hasten to it, but are at length imperceptibly impelled by the awakening of the thinking principle within us. We no sooner get into the second chamber, which I shall call the Chamber of Maiden-Thought, than we become intoxicated with the light and the atmosphere. We see nothing but pleasant wonders, and think of delaying there for ever in delight. However, among the effects this breathing is father of, is that tremendous one of sharpening one's vision into the heart and nature of man, of convincing one's nerves that the world is full of misery and heart-break, pain, sickness, and oppression; whereby this Chamber of Maiden-Thought becomes gradually darkened, and, at the same time, on all sides of it many doors are set open, but all dark—all leading to dark passages. We see not the balance of good and evil; we are in a mist; we feel the "Burden of the Mystery." To this point was Wordsworth come, as far as I can conceive, when he wrote "Tintern Abbey"; and it seems to me that his genius is explorative of these dark passages. Now if we live and go on thinking, we too shall explore them.'

Many passages might be quoted from his letters to prove that he was prepared to make the effort which success in such a venture demanded.

'I know nothing—I have read nothing—and I mean to follow Solomon's directions, "Get learning—get understanding." I find earlier days are gone by—I find that I can have no enjoyment in the world but continual drinking of knowledge. I find there is no worthy pursuit but the idea of doing some good in the world. There is but one way for me. The road lies through application, study, and thought. I will pursue it.'

Passages like these—and they abound in his letters—are not mere professions. Combined with his strenuous attempts at self-improvement, they show that a great force was leavening his mind: they prove that he had conceived a high ideal of Poetry, that he knew its highest exercise to be the interpretation of life, that he felt the mount of vision was inaccessible to all who had not assiduously toiled and laboured. The conception, and the effort were his. If he never passed from the Chamber of Maiden-Thought into the unknown apartment that lay beyond, he was prevented not by his sentimental super-sensuous character, but by his ill-health and his untimely death. He recognized his deficiencies and was determined to supply them.

Keats's feeling for beauty was almost overpowering in its strength; he displayed a gift of sensuous perception, a mastery over all the imagery of the senses, which few poets have ever equalled; and the powers which others exerted rarely and with effort were his easy, habitual manner. But his direct transcripts of sensations express nothing but themselves; they are literal not interpretative, naturalistic not moral. The main question, which

which suggests itself in regard to his poetry, is whether he could have soared into higher regions of his art, whether the sentimental colourist could become the intellectual artist. What signs are there that he would on some future day weave into his sensuous phantasies that artistic unity, or that thread of human interest without which they must inevitably remain tangled skeins of exuberant fancy, medleys of colours, scents, and sounds? What promise is there of thoughtfulness, what flashes of deeper meaning? What trace is there of the reflective and constructive intellect which should control and order the rich abundance of his perceptions? What sign of that moral and intellectual progress which exchanged a 'Venus and Adonis' for a 'Hamlet'?

All poets are peculiarly affected by the pleasures of one or more of the senses. But no man was ever born with richer physical elements of poetry than Keats. His quivering sensibility was universal; his electrical responsiveness of appreciation knew no limits. His lips trembled, his eyes flashed or moistened, his nerves tingled, his pulses bounded at every sensation of pain or pleasure, at every influence of any of the external senses. It was not that this or that sense was extraordinarily sharpened, but that each and all were preternaturally acute. Every delicate sensation of sound, scent, sight, touch or taste, thrilled the whole of his tremulously susceptible organization. This physical sensibility is the most marked characteristic among his poetic endowments. Nectareous tastes, sweet perfumes, exquisite forms of beauty, intricate shades of gorgeous colour, enchanting strains of music, the softness of wool-woofed carpets, the luxury of 'blanched linen, smooth and lavender'd,' play a conspicuous part in almost all his poetry. The whole of *The Eve of St. Agnes* might be quoted in support of the statement. What can be more splendid in its colouring than the description of the window

'diamonded with panes of quaint device,  
Innumerable of stains and splendid dyes,  
As are the tiger-moth's deep-damask'd wings;  
And in the midst, 'mong thousand heraldries,  
And twilight saints, and dim emblazonings,  
A shielded scutcheon blush'd with blood of queens and kings,'

—unless it is the description of Lamia;

'She was a Gordian shape of dazzling hue,  
Vermilion-spotted, golden, green, and blue;  
Striped like a zebra, fretted like a pard,  
Ey'd like a peacock, and all crimson barred;

And



And full of silver moons, that, as she breathed,  
Dissolv'd, or brighter shone, or interwreathed  
Their lustres with the gloomier tapestries.'

Another less familiar passage, which illustrates the same luxurious richness of sensuous perception, may be quoted from *Otho the Great*. Ludolph enters the Banqueting Hall of the Castle, filled with his guests:—

'A splendid company! rare beauties here!  
I should have Orphean lips, and Plato's fancy,  
Amphion's utterance, toned with his lyre,  
Or the deep key of Jove's sonorous mouth,  
To give fit salutation. . . .  
These draperies are fine, and, being a mortal,  
I should desire no better; yet, in truth,  
There must be some superior costliness,  
Some wider-domed high magnificence!  
I would have, as a mortal I may not,  
Hanging of heaven's clouds, purple and gold,  
Slung from the spheres; gauzes of silvered mist,  
Loop'd up with cords of twisted wreathed light,  
And tassell'd round with weeping meteors!  
These pendent lamps and chandeliers are bright  
As earthly fires from dull dross can be cleansed;  
Yet could my eye drink up intenser beams  
Undazzled,—this is darkness,—when I close  
These lids, I see far fiercer brilliances,—  
Skies full of splendid moons, and shooting stars,  
And spouting exhalations, diamond fires,  
And panting fountains quivering with deep glows!  
Yes—this is dark—is it not dark?'

Nor was this epicurean abandonment to the luxury and pleasure of sensuous enjoyment a mere poetic licence. Haydon says that Keats—and we believe that the story remains uncontradicted—

'once covered his tongue and throat as far as he could reach with cayenne pepper, in order to appreciate the delicious coldness of claret in all its glory—his own expression.'

His own letters confirm the anecdote. Two extracts will suffice as illustrations:—

'Talking of pleasure, this moment I was writing with one hand, and with the other holding to my mouth a nectarine—how fine! It went down soft, pulpy, slushy, oozy, all its delicious *embonpoint* melted down my throat like a large beatified strawberry.'

Or again:

'I am in a sort of temper, indolent, and supremely careless. I long after a stanza or two of Thomson's "Castle of Indolence;" my  
passions

passions are all asleep from my having slumbered till nearly eleven, and weakened the animal fibre all over me to a delightful sensation, about three degrees on this side of faintness. If I had teeth of pearl, and the breath of lilies, I should call it languor.'

No one is surprised when a man so constituted speaks of the advantages of 'the body overpowering the mind'; or sighs 'for a life of sensations rather than of thoughts.'

So long as Keats continued to be the pet of the Hampstead group, alternately the writer or the subject of panegyrical sonnets, the donor or the recipient of floral wreaths, the stronger side of his nature remained undeveloped. He was, in fact, the 'Johnny Keats' whom his sentimental friends represented him to be. He cultivated to excess his habit of thrilling at sights and sounds of pain or pleasure, and learned to glory in the effusive display of his emotion. He was right to be enthusiastic, right to exult in the spirit's genial throes, right to delight when he felt the life-blood within him flow in tides of power. But the enervated strain of unbalanced self-abandonment, the entire absence of reticence or dignified self-restraint, indicate grave deficiencies in his moral character, which were intensified and exaggerated by his unfortunate surroundings. It was the ill-judged flattery of his friends which prompted him to publish his first volume of poetry. Yet, with the exception of three or four of the pieces, it is impossible not to agree with Shelley in his friendly advice not to print his 'literary blights.' In this first volume, as well as *Endymion*, Keats is the poet of sensuous effusion and little more. He is the creature of sensations of which he gives us transcripts. He pours out his fancies without selection of thought or regard to diction, runs down his themes with wearisome insistence, follows his fancies into their wildest and most remote ramifications, weakens his most striking pictures by prosaic expressions, awkward inversions, or silly mannerisms.

Keats, in fact, wanted at this stage of his career moral purpose, definite opinions, power of concentration: he lacked knowledge of his art, knowledge of life, knowledge of literature. These were the defects which interrupted his efforts, made them broken and discontinuous, and obscured his genius, till, at the best, it was but a fitful flame. There is no impetus of passion behind his unreal visions. Consequently there is no continuous harmony, no one strong feeling that they embody—except that sense of Beauty which, to use his own expression, 'obliterates all considerations.' Extract the passion from *Epipsychidion*, and its beauties would lie in an inorganic, disordered mass like those of *Endymion*. Unlike Shelley, Keats had no fixed principles,

ciples, no philosophical system, no hostility to religion, no belief in the perfectibility of man, no determinate political views. 'I have,' he says, 'not one opinion upon anything except upon matters of taste.' He is satisfied to paint exquisite forms of beauty; he never desires either to penetrate to the truths of which they were emblems, or to use them as symbols of modern conflicts. Even his enjoyment of Nature is a purely visual sensation, a refined sense of form and colour. Love, the inspiration of youth, does not touch him; his verses to women are passionless; they only express with a cloying, almost nauseous sweetness the beauties on which

'the dazzled senses rest,  
Light feet, dark violet eyes, and parted hair,  
Soft dimpled hands, white neck, and creamy breast.'

or give vent to such hysterical sentiment as

'God! she is like a milk-white lamb that bleats  
For man's protection.'

His early poetry has been called pure, elemental, and essential. It is so, if by these epithets are meant that Keats cared little for depth of passion, or for strong human feeling; that there is in them no presentation of moral theses, no embodiment of character; that his verse depends on no interest in the story, no wit or wisdom in the maxims; that he writes as an indolent spectator of the universe, seeing only the flowers which the earth presented, feeling nothing of the burden of life, never exploring the dim and perilous way, never struggling to wrest from the world any portion of its secret. It is with an artist's instinctive perception of his strength and weakness, that he chose his subjects from the antique world—of his weakness, because he knew nothing of life,—of his strength, because here his own want of marked individuality ceased to be a defect and became a positive gain. A chameleon changing his indefinite personality with every creation of his fancy, he painted his radiant visions of sensuous beauty with that airy brightness which constitutes their most subtle charm, because he painted them without any infusion of the personal element. He succeeded by means of the very defects which hindered his creation of human characters, his inexperience of human nature, and his possession of no one unchangeable attribute.

In its poetic effervescence, its splendid superfluity of fancy, its lavish prodigality of invention, *Endymion* constitutes a marked advance on Keats's previous efforts. But the faults of his early poetry are all strongly marked. Keats is still rich in imagery but poor in thought, affluent in plastic power, deficient

deficient in the creative gift. The slight groundwork of the poem is mythological, but the thinly-outlined pattern of the piece is lost in the mosaic of bright tints and graceful images which are mingled without plan or order. The passage already quoted from his letters show that he regarded the composition only as a test or trial of invention. The result of this misconception of the construction of a poem is twofold. The wealth of invention is astonishingly great; but *Endymion* is not so much a poem as a May-Dream of Poetry. It is, to use Leigh Hunt's phrase, 'a wilderness of sweets, yet truly a wilderness.' Keats riots in the delicate fancies, which his mind creates in what Shelley calls 'indistinct profusion'; he makes no effort to control or direct his transport. *Endymion* is a rose-tinted cloudland, almost oriental in its gorgeous glow, flecked with every tint of brilliant colouring which youthful enthusiasm could crowd upon the canvas. It is a glittering masque of Fancy, from which Taste is banished and Reason is excluded.

This was the Poem which was criticized in this Review in April 1818. The Quarterly Reviewer makes five principal points against *Endymion* and its author. He says that the poem is meaningless and therefore unreadable; that the poet's prosodial notions are crude; that he follows the association of sounds rather than of ideas, and that the rhyme of the last line is the catchword for the thought of the next; that his diction is newly coined, far-fetched, and barbarous; that his faults are those of the so-called 'Cockney School' of which Leigh Hunt is the hierophant. From first to last there is no personal allusion to Keats or his profession, and not the slightest trace of political animosity. We propose to consider these five points in their order.

The Quarterly Reviewer complains that he could not read the Poem through. He was not singular in his experience. Shelley says, 'Much praise is due to me for having read it, the author's intention appearing to be that no person should possibly get to the end of it.' In 1820 Keats published a volume of Poems which have placed him, to quote Mr. Arnold, 'with Shakespeare.' In this volume were *Isabella*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *Lamia*, the Odes *On a Grecian Urn*, *To Psyche*, *To Autumn* and *To a Nightingale*, *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, and *The Eve of St. Mark*. Whoever now studies *Endymion* reads it with the knowledge, that the author has written poetry which places him in the first rank of English poets. Yet Mr. Rossetti admits that even now, in spite of all the prestige of subsequent achievement,

'there

'there are at this day several Keats-enthusiasts who know in *foro conscientiae*, though they may not avow in public, that they have left *Endymion* unread or only partially read.'

The Quarterly Reviewer goes on to say, that Keats allows himself to write lines at random, and follow the thoughts suggested by the rhyme with which each concludes. This point is fully conceded by the warmest of his admirers. Leigh Hunt says :—

'Dryden modestly confessed that a rhyme had often helped him to a thought. Keats, in the tyranny of his wealth, forced his rhymes to help him, whether they would or not; and they obeyed him with equal promptitude and ungainliness.'

But it is unnecessary to labour a point which is abundantly evident, and which is incontestably confirmed by the erasures and alterations in the MS. of the poem. Crabbe's lines may be well applied to Keats, even on the evidence of his chief ally :—

'Thoughtless of ill, and to the future blind,  
A sudden couplet rushes on his mind,  
The infection spreads, the couplets grow apace,  
Stanzas to Delia's dog or Celia's face.'

Thirdly, the Reviewer attacks his versification. This had been carefully varied according to Keats's immature ideas of prosody; but the result remained crudely experimental. Leigh Hunt says that Keats

'had a just contempt for the monotonous termination of everyday couplets; he broke up his lines in order to distribute the rhyme properly; but going only upon the ground of his contempt, and not yet having settled with himself any principle of versification, the very exuberance of his ideas led him to make use of the first rhymes that offered; so that, by a new meeting of extremes, the effect was as artificial and much more obtrusive than the one under the old system.'

The fourth point of criticism is the oddity of the diction. No one will deny, that Keats adorned the language with new words, that he turned nouns into verbs, coined new nouns, compounded new adjectives and new adverbs. For many of these practices Keats could claim the support of Elizabethan writers or of Milton. Many of his obscure words may be traced to Chaucer, or Spenser, or Chapman. Like Milton, he turned substantives into participial adjectives, such as '*slabbed margin of a well*,' or gave them a compound form as in '*deep-recessed*'; but he defied all precedent when he transforms nouns or adjectives

adjectives into real participles. Still worse, though not unprecedented, are his adjectives formed by the addition of *y* to a substantive, e.g. 'nervy,' 'bloomy,' 'slumbery.' Here again there can be no dispute, that the charge is abundantly true.

Lastly, the Reviewer attacks Keats as a follower of Leigh Hunt. And here also he was indisputably right. The literary influence of Leigh Hunt upon Keats was little short of disastrous, and it is conspicuous in *Endymion*. Keats's versification is modelled on that of Hunt, especially on his use of divided couplets and dissyllabic rhymes; his worst faults of taste in diction may be traced to the same source; his trivialities are derived from a confusion of frank simplicity with Hunt's drawing-room chit-chat. The ground of the attack is expressly based, not upon political opinion, but upon literary influence. It is made because the Reviewer detects in Keats 'powers of language, rays of fancy, gleams of genius'; because the poet displays 'a degree of talent which deserves to be put in the right way or which at least ought to be warned of the wrong'; and because 'he is of an age and temper which imperiously require mental discipline.' That the Quarterly Reviewer was not alone in thinking that Hunt's literary influence over Keats was disastrous is proved by the evidence of the author of *Adonais*. 'The fragment called Hyperion' (and this, it must be remembered, was published two years later than *Endymion*, which came out in a volume by itself),

'proves for him (Keats) that he is destined to become one of the first writers of the age. His other things are imperfect enough, and, what is worse, written in the bad sort of style which is becoming fashionable among those who fancy that they are imitating Hunt and Wordsworth.'

Shelley himself had learnt much from Hunt; but he was too high-bred and cultivated to run any risk from the vulgarisms of taste which the ill-trained Keats so readily imbibed. Byron shared the same opinion of the Quarterly Reviewer and of Shelley, as to the fact of this fatal influence.

'As Mr. Keats does not want imagination or industry, let those who have led him astray look to what they have done. Surely they must feel no little remorse in having so perverted the taste and feelings of this young man, and will be satisfied with one such victim to the Moloch of their absurdity.'

Or again,

'He (Keats) took the wrong line as a poet, and was spoiled by Cockneyfying and Suburbing, and versifying Tooke's Pantheon and Lemprière's Dictionary.'

The

The language used towards Hunt by the Quarterly Reviewer is not more severe or contemptuous than any critic, who was convinced of his enervating influence upon literature, was justified in using. But, although the quarrel is not ours, we confess we cannot understand Mr. Colvin's meaning, when he speaks of the 'paradoxical rancour' with which 'the gentle Hunt' was 'persecuted in *Blackwood*.' Throughout 1817 unsigned articles in the *Examiner*, of which Hunt was the editor, and for which he was therefore legally and morally responsible, styled Burke a 'malignant renegade' and an 'apostate'; or charged Southey with riotous self-complacency, 'pert pettifogging spite,' 'studied malice'; called him a 'cad,' a 'canting hypocrite,' a 'servile court-tool,' a 'shallow idiot'; sneered at his 'grey hairs' as 'few' and 'contemptible,' and compared him to a man who is kept by a prostitute; or assailed the editor of the *Times* as a 'green-eyed, velvet-pawed philosopher,' a 'pert pragmatistical plebeian,' who 'pours out foul abuse, reeking and running over from the filthy sty of dunghill Billingsgate, which his spite and dulness has raked together.' The same style of language is used towards all the editor's political opponents. If this is 'gentle' Hunt, Mr. Colvin's standard of literary violence must be high.

*Endymion* sometimes degenerates, to use Leigh Hunt's own phrase, into 'poetical effeminacy.' 'But,' he adds, 'Keats was aware of this contradiction to the real energy of his nature, and prepared to get rid of it.' With this we fully agree. The weaknesses of the poem were unworthy of Keats's developed character. But the first outward sign which Keats gave of this fact was his emancipation from Hunt's influence. In February 1818, he had written to his friend Reynolds:

'Modern poets differ from the Elizabethans in this. Each of the moderns, like an Elector of Hanover, governs his petty state and knows how many straws are swept daily from the causeways in all his dominions, and has a continual itching that all the housewives should have all their coppers well scoured. The ancients were emperors of vast provinces; they had only heard of the remote ones, and scarcely cared to visit them. I will cut all this. I will have no more of Wordsworth, and Hunt in particular.'

In other letters of nearly the same date, he writes of the development of his powers:

'I think a little change has taken place in my intellect lately; I cannot bear to be uninterested or unemployed, I, who for so long a time have been addicted to passiveness. Nothing is finer for the purposes of great productions than a very gradual ripening of the intellectual powers.'

Or



Or again,

'An extensive knowledge is needful to thinking people; it takes away the heat and fever, and helps by widening speculation to ease "the burden of the mystery," a thing which I begin to understand a little.'

With such feelings working in his mind, Keats set himself to explore the dark passages that led from the Chamber of Maiden-Thought in which he had hitherto lingered. *Endymion*, in fact, purged his poetic nature of the dross which mingled with the ore. He himself regarded the composition in this light.

'I will write,' he says, 'independently. I have written independently *without judgment*. I may write independently, and *with judgment*, hereafter. The Genius of Poetry must work out its own salvation in a man. It cannot be matured by law and precept, but by sensation and watchfulness in itself. That which is creative must create itself. In "*Endymion*" I leaped headlong into the sea, and thereby have become better acquainted with the soundings, the quicksands, and the rocks, than if I had stayed upon the green shore, and piped a silly pipe, and took tea and comfortable advice. I was never afraid of failure; for I would sooner fail than not be among the greatest.'

His growth is visible in his emancipation from the Hampstead school, in his awakening sense of the higher purposes of poetry, in his efforts at self-improvement, in his attempt at dramatic writing, in his composition of a classic epic instead of a Gothic romance of mythology, in his adoption of themes in which real human interest was blended with the purely supernatural, in the resolution to abandon *Hyperion* which he adopted from sheer devotion to the principles of his art. Above all, the change is visible in the character of his work. The abundance and universality of his sensuous nature still permeate his poetry. Its atmosphere is one of intoxicating languor. It creates an impression of studied luxury; it breathes an air of dainty dreaminess and delicate voluptuousness, which rather proceeds from his keen delight in all the varied pleasures of the senses, than from the richness of his language, or the soft melody of his harmonious versification. But in concentration and substance it is immeasurably strengthened.

The most conclusive evidence, that the genius of Keats was not stunted by adverse criticism, is found in the fact, that all his best work was written subsequently to the publication of *Endymion*. His fame rests on the contents of his third volume, which was published in 1820,—upon *Isabella, or the Pot of Basil*; *Lamia*,

*Lamia*, *Hyperion*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *The Eve of St. Mark*, *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, and the *Odes To a Nightingale*, *on Indolence*, *To Psyche*, *To Autumn*, and *On a Grecian Urn*. The unfinished state of *Hyperion* does not in any way contradict the statement. Much as we may regret its fragmentary condition, Keats deliberately decided upon its abandonment. He has himself explicitly stated his reason. 'I have,' he says, 'given up *Hyperion*—there were too many Miltonic inversions in it; Miltonic verse cannot be written but in artful, or, rather artist's humour.' Already, as it seems to us, there are signs that the poem could not have been completed in the spirit with which it was commenced. Apart from the comparison with Milton which it necessarily challenged, the want of action and of movement is conspicuous. Even *Hyperion* himself appears in the Council of the Gods breathing forth dejected sighs,

'while his hands contemplative  
He press'd together, and in silence stood.'

We accept Byron's praise; *Hyperion* 'seems actually inspired by the Titans, and is as sublime as "Æschylus."' But we also agree with Mr. Swinburne, that 'Keats never gave such proof of a manly devotion and rational sense of duty to his art as in his resolution to leave this great poem unfinished.'

The range of power which Keats displays in the last volume of his poetry is very wide and varied. Except *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, none of the poems, speaking strictly, possess that utter faultlessness or that absolute perfection which have been assigned to them by enthusiastic critics. But both the narrative and reflective verse contained in this third volume are of a poetic value, which has been seldom equalled, and more rarely exceeded. The artistic achievement is masterly, the promise amazing, abnormal, unprecedented. As it is, they are among the richest gems of English poetry. Even in *Isabella*, which, critically considered, is perhaps the weakest composition in the volume, Keats has accomplished a gigantic advance. He makes an evident effort to grapple with his subject, and to give reality to his creations. He subordinates description to incident, if not to character; his imagination is at once disciplined and strengthened; he does not pour out with indiscriminate rush all his thoughts, but selects the most appropriate; he is at once more moderate and more sure in his touch.

*Hyperion* affords an opportunity of measuring Keats's progress by the comparison which it provokes with *Endymion*. Suffice it to say here, that the luxuriations are pruned, the digressions have disappeared, scene follows scene in order, the workmanship

ship is well sustained, words are weighed by their meaning as well as by their sound. The whole is stately, dignified, and even solemn. The opening picture of Saturn, the dethroned and exiled monarch, is sublime in its colossal, primeval grandeur. It is totally without sentiment, for Saturn is too great for pity. But what an advance does this reticence denote upon the effusiveness of the immature poet! how exquisitely skilful, yet how strongly self-restrained, is the sympathy of nature, which intensifies the lonely majesty of the fallen rather by the hush of motionless, yet palpitating, life! It may not be wholly fanciful to see in the poem itself an allusion to the poet's gradual transformation. If *Endymion* had a meaning, it meant the search of the poet for his vocation. Peona represents the physical side of nature, and the struggle in Endymion's breast arises from the working of the spiritual qualities within him, which incite him to leave her for the pursuit of higher ends. So, too, in *Hyperion*, the older race of the Gods represents the worship of the Titanic forces of nature, and their defeat by the personified powers of reason, wisdom, and strength of purpose. The choice of both subjects thus illustrates the mental change through which Keats himself was passing. He is at once an Endymion and a Titan.

No less remarkable for its assured power is the rich and glowing colouring of *The Eve of St. Agnes*, with all its gorgeous accessories of decoration. The stroke is just as certain, the art is to the full as admirable, with which Keats paints in the atmosphere of the medieval romance. But the canon of criticism which we apply to *Hyperion*, and to this marvellous study of melody and colour, is completely reversed. Here the highest praise is not that there is not a word too much, but that there is not a word too little.

Equally striking in its different style is the *Eve of St. Mark*, so essentially medieval in spirit, so quaintly pre-Raphaelite in its minuteness of detail. The lyrical ballad, *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, stands alone among Keats's Poems. It is concise almost to bareness; but it rivals *Christabel*, and higher praise can scarcely be given, in the witchery of its weird intensity, in the simplicity of the means by which the effect is produced, in the magic of language by which the poet conveys the imaginative impression. *Lamia*, less imaginative, less lyrical, and more elaborate, than the Ballad, belongs to the more ordinary class of realistic narrative. In this field it is Keats's masterpiece. Neither the illogical moral, nor the misplaced descriptions, weaken the force, nor obscure the vividness, with which the story is told. His own criticism upon the poem is abundantly

dantly justified: 'I am certain that there is that sort of fire in it which must take hold of people in some way—give them either pleasant or unpleasant sensation.'

If we pass from the narrative to the reflective portion of the volume, the quality of the Odes alone would place Keats among the first of English poets. It is needless to attempt to appraise their poetic value, to set their respective prices upon the Ode to a Nightingale, or the Ode on a Grecian Urn. The tone of all is pensive and brooding rather than fierce; but the passion is none the less intense because its expression is not vehement. They are the best embodiments of Keats's powers; they are also the most suggestive commentaries on his peculiar genius. In them is summed up Keats's poetic and artistic creed:—

'Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all  
Ye know on earth and all ye need to know.'

In them are displayed at their best the sumptuous affluence of his sensuous equipment, the passionate glow of his love for beauty in all things, the rare gift of subtle perception which rewards his single-hearted worship, the fervour and the freshness of his feeling for external nature. From them may be drawn the highest illustrations of his faculty for condensed, exhaustive, pictorial expression; his Spenserian gift of picture-making epithets; his artistic instinct for colour, form, or melody. They afford the truest examples of his imaginative sympathy with the sentiment of the sensuous atmosphere which he habitually breathed, of the wide receptivity of his Protean mind, which was open to the varied impressions of romance, whether of fairyland, mythology, or medievalism; of the depth and clearness of his insight into the life and spirit of classic art. They show the most perfect instances of his susceptibility to the changing influences of the moment, of his capacity for the luxury both of joy and sorrow, of the rapid play within his mind of the lights and shades of pain and pleasure.

The quantity of Keats's best poetry is small, but in value it is priceless. His career was first checked, and then cut short, at a moment when his mind was expanding with extraordinary rapidity. It is wrong to number the qualities of which he gave promise, the genius to which he aspired, among the constituent elements of his exercised powers. But there can be no question that his writings show abundant traces of a thirst for a higher sphere of thought, a growing habit of introspection, and an increasing feeling of that self-consciousness which is the discipline of the poet. Nor do these signs of expansion consist only in professions. They had already borne fruit in his

deepened sense of the importance of his vocation, his clear perception of his own faults, his sturdily-kept determination to prepare for loftier efforts. Traces linger, even in his best poetry, of a morbid temperament; there still remains a want of manly robustness and of virile fibre. But, on the other hand, the growing strength of his character is embodied in the striking development of his poetic powers. The effeminacy of his nature underwent rigorous discipline, which had already yielded rich fruit, and promised still more priceless harvests. He who mastered the magic of external nature, who penetrated to the very heart of the life of antiquity, who possessed himself of the essential spirit of medievalism, might yet have interpreted the problems which beset our human existence. His fatal passion for Fanny Brawne brought out once more all the weaker elements of his character, broke down the self-control which he had painfully acquired, and impaired the strength of his constitution, when its powers of resistance were most urgently needed. Under happier circumstances he might have defied the disease, which claimed as its victim one who, by his rich gifts, his rare achievements, and his dazzling promise, has amply justified his title of the young Marcellus of English poetry.

---

ART. III.—1. *Historical and Descriptive Catalogue of the Pictures, Busts, &c., in the National Portrait Gallery.* By George Scharf, Esq., F.S.A., Director, Keeper, and Secretary, 1884.

2. *Reports of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery presented to Parliament from 1858 to 1887.*

IN a former number of this Review we placed before our readers an account of the National Gallery.\* We now propose to invite their attention to a sister institution—the National Portrait Gallery. The origin, history, and career of both institutions have been in many respects similar. They were both born in somewhat narrow and obscure quarters—the one in the private residence of Mr. Angerstein in Pall Mall; the other in a modest dwelling-house in Great George Street, Westminster. They have both had a hard struggle, extending over many years, with Governments indifferent to Art, and to its influence upon the national taste, and consequently to its actual commercial value, and with niggardly and unsympathizing Chancellors of the Exchequer. They both long clamoured, and are still clamouring, in vain for sufficient space to exhibit their treasures to the public, for whose gratification and instruction, and with whose money, they have been acquired. They have been sent from pillar to post as a little more room has been grudgingly doled out to them. The National Gallery, as we have seen, was cribbed for many years in half-a-dozen rooms in the building in Trafalgar Square, and has but recently received an inadequate addition to that patchwork edifice in which to display its unrivalled collection.† The National Portrait Gallery—after running the imminent risk of disappearing altogether in a conflagration—has been banished to the remote regions of Bethnal Green, there to remain until ‘My Lords’ of

\* See ‘Quarterly Review’ for October 1886.

† We may, however, refer with unqualified praise to the new rooms which were opened in the summer of last year. Although the space at the disposal of the Trustees is still far from sufficient for the proper exhibition of the, in some respects, unrivalled collection of the works of foreign and native artists which the country possesses, the pictures are now, for the most part, seen to far greater advantage than they were before this addition to the building, and the Director has been able to a certain extent to classify them according to schools—a classification upon which we insisted in the Article on the National Gallery to which we have referred. We greatly regret, however, to learn that the Government still persists in suspending the annual grant until the money spent upon the Blenheim Raphael and Van Dyck is recouped—a measure seriously injurious to the interests of the Institution, as it prevents the Director from acquiring pictures not only of intrinsic merit but necessary to the complete illustration of a school which may be offered for sale, and for the acquisition of which no opportunity may again occur.

the Treasury, or the Office of Works, or whatever other Government department may have to do with the matter, can make up their minds as to its permanent resting-place. When we have traced its migrations, and have shown the dangers to which it has been wantonly exposed, our readers, we are induced to believe, will agree with us in thinking that so important and interesting a collection, and one so intimately associated with the national glories of England by perpetuating the memory of her most famous men, has rarely, if ever, been so scurvily treated by a wealthy and civilized country.

The idea of collecting the portraits of illustrious and celebrated men—warriors, statesmen, philosophers, poets, orators, and legists—is by no means a modern one. We know that such collections were made in the time of the Roman Republic and Empire by Atticus, Varro, and others. In later times—in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—learned scholars, such as Paolo Giovio, the Italian historian, sought to bring together the likenesses of distinguished personages of all countries. In the seventeenth, James I. of England employed the Dutch painters, Van Somer and Marc Gheeraedts, to portray for him some of those most renowned for rank and merit among his subjects. Charles I.—who was famed for his love of art and for the protection which he extended to artists—formed a collection of ‘heads,’ as they were termed, which was not confined to eminent Englishmen. The series of portraits in his palace at Whitehall remained there until after the fire, which destroyed a part of that building in 1691, when they were transferred to Kensington Palace. There they continued until, in comparatively recent times, they were dispersed among the royal residences of Hampton Court, Windsor Castle, and St. James’s.

Amongst the best known private collections of portraits in England in the seventeenth century were those of Lord Pembroke and Lord Clarendon. That of the latter, comprising some of the finest works of Van Dyck, was divided after his death between his two heiresses, in the hands of whose descendants, we believe, they for the most part still remain. Pepys appears to have been one of the earliest collectors in England of engraved portraits, of which he succeeded in acquiring a large number. Of later date are the collections of private institutions, some of considerable interest, such as those of the Royal Society and of the Society of Antiquaries, which contain many historical portraits of great value. The Garrick Club possesses a remarkable series of the likenesses of the most celebrated actors and actresses who have adorned the English stage.

But all these collections, being private and not public property,



perty, were liable to be broken up, and, with the exception of those belonging to societies, to be dispersed on the death of their owners. Permanent collections of this nature, made by a Government for public instruction and enjoyment, and paid for out of public funds, are of comparatively modern date. Those that exist are of a very miscellaneous character, and have not been formed with especial reference to the political, literary, and artistic, history of the nation which possesses them. Such, for instance, is the extensive series of portraits once appertaining to the Medici family, which is still preserved in the public Gallery of Florence, and that in the same gallery of the portraits of painters of all nations, mostly executed by themselves, and presented by them on the occasion of their election as members of the Florentine Academy of Fine Arts, and containing consequently many masterpieces in portraiture.

The largest modern collection is, however, that in the Palace of Versailles. It comprises some thousands of portraits, and includes those of men and women of all countries, whatever may be their claims to distinction; but many of them are not trustworthy, and no particular care appears to have been bestowed upon their selection. They are principally hung in the apartments on the second floor; but in the halls in which are exhibited the vast canvasses mostly illustrating the military history of France, those who took part in the events to which they refer, and the royal personages during whose reigns they occurred, are separately represented. With the exception of that of the French generals in the 'Salles des Maréchaux,' there is no series of portraits confined to eminent Frenchmen, specially formed and arranged, so as to be a distinctly National Portrait Gallery. No chronological or other classification is attempted, and no information is given as to the person portrayed, except such as may be found, not without difficulty, in the bulky and inconvenient official catalogue. Consequently the visitor or the student, who wanders through the labyrinth of halls, finds his brain as much wearied as his feet, and derives but little information or enjoyment from the innumerable physiognomies—mostly of persons in whom he takes little or no interest—arrayed before him. Like most undertakings projected in France during the Imperial régime, the Versailles Collection was conceived and carried out on a gigantic scale. Portraits, statues, busts, tombs, and other memorials of all manner of persons, were brought together from royal residences, from public buildings and institutions, from Government depots, and from every quarter where such objects existed,  
and

and whence they could be removed. The Museum at Versailles, according to the preface to the catalogue of its contents, 'consacré à toutes les gloires de la France, est la collection la plus nombreuse, et la plus variée d'ouvrages d'art qu'une nation ait jamais ouverte aux souvenirs de son histoire; sièges et batailles, conquêtes, croisades, faits historiques, cérémonies, personnages illustres par le sang, le génie, le courage, la science et la beauté; tableaux, portraits, statues, tombeaux; c'est comme on l'a voulu, une sorte de Panthéon de nos illustrations.' \*

\*\* When it is added that portraits of persons of other nations, besides Frenchmen, distinguished in war, in politics, and in all branches of human knowledge, are included in this marvellous collection, some conception may be formed of its magnitude.†

Some of the principal picture galleries of Europe—such as those of Dresden and Vienna—contain collections of portraits. But they are on a limited scale, and were not purposely made to illustrate the history—political, literary, or scientific—of the country to which they belong.

The first attempt in England to form a collection of English portraits was made by the Governors of the British Institution in the year 1820. They completely filled their well-known rooms in Pall Mall with 183 portraits which they were able to obtain on loan. Encouraged by the interest shown by the public in this Exhibition, they opened a second in 1846, which contained 215 portraits, not, however, exclusively English.

It was probably the success of these two Exhibitions which led the managers of the Manchester 'Art Treasures Exhibition' of 1857 to include in it a collection of portraits specially intended to illustrate the history of England in all its branches. Mainly through the exertions and support of the late Lord Derby, who was a most liberal contributor to it, they brought together about 400 portraits, including some of the highest interest and importance, both on account of their merit as works of art, and of the eminence and celebrity of the persons represented. They were obtained on loan, in some instances from public institutions, but mostly from private individuals, who generously

\* 'Notices des Peintures et Sculptures composant le Musée Impérial de Versailles,' par E. Soulié, 1854. We understand that it is the intention of the French Government to form a collection of portraits of distinguished Frenchmen and Frenchwomen, in avowed imitation of our National Portrait Gallery, which is to find a place in the Galleries of the Louvre.

† The halls of the 'Institut de France,' at Paris, contain an interesting collection of busts of eminent members of the French Academy, including those of many of the most illustrious men in science, literature and art, that France has produced.

responded to the invitations made to them to contribute. The portraits thus temporarily acquired were carefully and judiciously classified and arranged by the late Mr. Peter Cunningham, who was specially qualified for the task. The collection, which was of course dispersed at the close of the Exhibition, excited so much public interest, that the idea occurred, we believe in the first instance to Lord Derby, of forming a similar collection in London. But it was not put into execution, on account of the want of a proper locality to receive it, until Sir Henry Cole recommended as suitable to the purpose a series of Galleries in the South Kensington Museum which had been left vacant after the Great International Exhibition of 1862. The scheme, which was planned on a far larger scale than that at Manchester, required time, and much research and inquiry, to be adequately carried out. It was not, consequently, put into execution until the year 1866. By that time the loan of no less than 2846 portraits of English men and women—including the most distinguished characters in English history and some of the greatest rarity and value—had been promised. Private families, collectors, and, in some instances, public institutions, contributed most readily to an exhibition, which promised to be of great national interest and importance.

The number of portraits thus obtained was so large, that it was found necessary to extend the period of their exhibition over three years—the first section being shown in 1866, the last in 1868. They were arranged, as far as possible, chronologically, and formed the largest, the most complete, and the most instructive, collection of the kind that has ever been brought together in this or any other country. An excellent catalogue added to its value.

The Exhibitions which we have described were but of a temporary nature. Many distinguished men of letters considered it very desirable that the nation should possess a permanent collection of the portraits of eminent and celebrated Englishmen. Long before the Manchester Exhibition was opened they had sought to prevail upon the Government to found a National Portrait Gallery upon the same principle as the National Gallery of Pictures—similarly administered, and supported by annual grants from the public funds. It was, however, reserved for the late Lord Stanhope to bring the scheme before the public in a form which would admit of its practical execution. On June 4, 1852, when as Lord Mahon he was a Member of the House of Commons, he referred, during a discussion on the Estimates, to the subject as one which deserved the favourable consideration of the Government. He stated that some years before, during  
the

the Administration of Sir Robert Peel, he had ventured to make the suggestion that a National Portrait Gallery ought to be formed—a suggestion, he said, which appeared to meet with very general approval. Mr. Disraeli, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and who was at all times a warm and enlightened advocate, and a liberal supporter, of all such undertakings, replied that he ‘considered Lord Mahon’s suggestion a very valuable one, and hoped that it would receive that consideration to which it was entitled;’ and he stigmatized the absence of a building for the reception of such a collection as almost ‘a stain upon the national taste:’\* words which, as it will be seen, might well be remembered at the present time by the public and by the Government.

Soon after this discussion in the House of Commons, Lord Derby, then Prime Minister, who would, no doubt, have given the scheme his earnest support, went out of office, and it remained in abeyance until it was brought before the House of Lords on the 4th of March, 1856, by its original advocate, who had become Lord Stanhope. In a very interesting speech he pointed out the many advantages of a national collection of portraits of distinguished Englishmen. ‘It would afford,’ he said, ‘not only great pleasure, but much instruction to the industrious classes’—a prediction which has been fully verified—and would prove of great use to painters who desired to treat subjects from English history. In support of his views, he read a letter addressed to him by Mr. Carlyle, a passage from which, although in the affected redundancy of language characteristic of the writer, we are tempted to quote, as many of our readers may have experienced the same desire for a portrait which he thus picturesquely describes:—

‘Every student and reader of history who strives earnestly to conceive for himself what manner of fact and man this or the other historical name can have been, will, as the first and directest indication of all, search eagerly for a portrait. . . . Often have I found a portrait superior in real instruction to half-a-dozen written biographies, as biographies are written; or rather let me say, I have found that the portrait was as a small lighted candle, by which the biographies could for the first time be read, and some human interpretation be made of them.’

Lord Stanhope further laid down the principles, and sketched the plan upon which such a Gallery should be formed. He pointed out that ‘there ought not to be in the collection a single portrait as to which a man of good education passing round and

\* See ‘Hansard’s Debates’ for June 1852.

seeing the name in the catalogue would be under the necessity of asking "Who is he?" He stated, that in the absence of such an institution, many portraits of eminent Englishmen of the highest value and interest, which should have been acquired for the nation, had passed, at a recent period, into private hands. He specially instanced a full-length portrait of Pitt, by Gainsborough, which had been sold, at an auction, to Sir Robert Peel for 100 guineas,\* and one of Chatham, also bought by Sir Robert, for 80 guineas. He showed that there were already materials in the possession of the public to lay the foundation of such a gallery, and suggested the removal to it of the historical portraits preserved in the Palace at Hampton Court.

Lord Stanhope's proposal was very favourably received by the House of Lords. Several Peers expressed opinions in its support, and it was advocated in an eloquent and forcible speech by Lord Ellenborough, who specially dwelt upon the importance of maintaining a high standard of selection of the portraits—care being taken that only those of persons who had real claims to distinction should be admitted. He even went so far as to suggest that every twenty or thirty years there should be appointed 'a Commission of Revision—a censorship in fact—for the purpose of removing those which, through the erroneous judgment of their own contemporaries, had been improperly admitted.' There were many persons, he remarked, who were mentioned by contemporary writers as great or celebrated, of whose names he confessed to being ignorant, and of whom he would be compelled to ask, 'Who is he?' On the other hand, there were many distinguished men of letters and others whose portraits it was either impossible or very difficult to obtain. It was not such men who had their portraits taken, but usually 'aldermen, sheriffs, railway directors, rich grocers, rich merchants, speculators, and wealthy Regent Street tradesmen.'

The Lords resolved unanimously that an address should be presented to the Queen, praying her to take into her consideration the expediency of forming a Gallery of the Portraits of the most eminent persons in British history.

The proposal having received the Royal Assent, no time was lost in taking steps to put it into execution—Parliament voting, in the following June, a grant of 2000*l.* for the purpose. A board of Trustees was shortly after appointed. The selection

\* The great rise in the price of pictures within the last few years cannot be better exemplified than by comparing this purchase with that of a portrait of John Russell, fourth Duke of Bedford, by the same painter, from the Blenheim collection, in July of 1885, for which the Trustees of the National Gallery paid 630*l.* Many thousands of pounds have recently been paid by wealthy, if not discriminating, amateurs and collectors for Gainsborough's female portraits.

was as good as possible. The Trustees—thirteen in number—included men equally distinguished for their social position and for their connexion with literature and art—such as Lord Lansdowne, Lord Ellesmere, Sidney Herbert, Disraeli, Macaulay, and Sir Charles Eastlake, to whom were added two well-known experts and connoisseurs, Mr. William Smith and Mr. Carpenter, the Keeper of the Prints in the British Museum. Lord Stanhope, not only as a proper acknowledgment of the part he had taken in founding the Gallery, but as a tribute to his recognized historical and literary acquirements, was elected chairman of the board.\* On his death, in 1876, Lord Hardinge was unanimously chosen by the Trustees for his successor—a choice which has been fully justified by the valuable services which he has rendered to the institution.

The success of an undertaking of this nature must depend, to a great extent, upon the selection of the person, upon whom the duty devolves of carrying it out in its details, and who is practically charged with its direction and management. Honorary Trustees, however ready they may be to devote gratuitous labour to its superintendence, and however anxious to promote its interests, can scarcely be expected to give their time to the daily work which is absolutely required for the purpose. They are mostly men in high and responsible positions, with numerous and urgent occupations. All that can consequently be expected of them is a general supervision. The first duty, therefore, of the Trustees was to appoint a competent secretary. The union in one person of the qualifications which are required in the organizer and director of a National Portrait Gallery is of rare occurrence—business habits, intimate acquaintance with the history of England, political and literary, and even with the dress, in its minutest details, of a particular period, upon which the identification of a portrait, and its authenticity, must frequently depend, artistic skill, and a critical and practical knowledge of Art. But it generally happens that when some great and novel scheme is to be put into execution, the man required for the task is, as it were, providentially provided. This was notably the case in the present instance. The choice of the Trustees fell upon Mr. George Scharf. A more admirable and fortunate selection could not have been made. Mr. Scharf united all the qualifications we have enumerated. For thirty years he has held the combined offices and performed the multi-

---

\* The surviving members of the original board are Lord Granville (who was when it was constituted, President of the Council, and consequently a member ex-officio), Lord Wemyss (then Lord Elcho), and Lord Salisbury (then Lord Robert Cecil).

farious duties of Director, Keeper, and Secretary, including the compilation of an excellent catalogue of the collection. To his unwearied exertions, to his sound judgment and tact, and to the general esteem and confidence which he has inspired, is to be attributed the remarkable success achieved by the National Portrait Gallery, and the important position as a national institution to which it has attained. If we were called upon to name three men who have done more than any others to promote the development of Art in England for national purposes—that is to say, for the education of the people, for the improvement of the public taste, and for public enjoyment—we should be disposed to name Sir Charles Eastlake as the Director of the National Gallery, Sir Henry Cole as the founder of the South Kensington Museum, and Mr. Scharf who has brought together our collection of British Portraits.

The administration of the institution having been organized, the next step to be taken was to lay down the principles upon which a National Portrait Gallery should be formed. The following rules were adopted by the Trustees for their guidance ; 1st, that in making purchases, or receiving presents, the celebrity of the person represented rather than the merit of the artist should be looked to, and that that celebrity should be estimated without bias to any political or religious party, and that great faults and errors, even if admitted on all sides, were not to be considered as sufficient grounds for excluding any portrait which might be valuable as illustrating the civil, ecclesiastical or literary history of the country. 2ndly. That no portrait of any person still living—except only of the reigning sovereign, and of his or her consort—should be admitted, unless in a group or series of persons, some living and some deceased, comprised in the same picture and combined for one common object. 3rdly. That no portrait of any person deceased less than ten years should be admitted, if so many as three of the Trustees should personally, if present at the meeting, or within one fortnight by letter, state their dissent. 4thly. That no portrait should be admitted by donation, unless three-fourths, at least, of the Trustees present at a meeting should approve of it. And lastly, That no modern copy of an original portrait should be admitted. These regulations were wise and judicious. In the following remarks we shall have to consider how far they have been acted upon and enforced.

The Gallery was appropriately inaugurated by the munificent gift by Lord Ellesmere, a short time before his death, of the portrait of the greatest genius that England has produced, and one of the greatest that the world has seen—the famous  
'Chandos



'Chandos Shakespear'—which he had recently purchased at the sale of the Duke of Buckingham's effects at Stowe. Of this celebrated picture, which is naturally calculated to excite greater public attention and interest than any other portrait, Mr. Scharf, with becoming caution, wrote:—

'That it is distinguished by having a longer history than any of the other painted portraits connected with the name of the poet; and is certainly, in itself, a genuine and fairly well-preserved picture of the commencement of the seventeenth century, painted probably before 1610. Its existence as a recognised portrait of Shakspeare can be readily traced back to a time when there was no popular demand for his works, or even such a general appreciation of his merits among the better educated as to make a counterfeit or misapplication of his name apparently worth any one's while.\*

The first portrait purchased by the Trustees was that of Sir Walter Raleigh, attributed to Zucharo, and in all probability taken from the life. The Trustees had thus obtained for the foundation of a National Portrait Gallery the likenesses of two of the most notable and illustrious characters in English history. They were further able to state in their first report, made in May 1858, that they had already acquired thirteen portraits by donation, and twenty-two by purchase, some of great interest and value.

The National Portrait Gallery was thus founded under the most favourable auspices. It only remained for the Government to provide a proper place for its reception, and for the adequate display to the public of the collection of portraits, which, there was every reason to believe, would rapidly increase. It was obvious that the success of the scheme depended, in no small degree, upon the Gallery being made attractive and useful to the public. The possessors of valuable portraits would be more disposed to offer them to the nation, if they were persuaded that their gifts would be properly appreciated by being exhibited in a worthy manner; whilst, on the other hand, Parliament would be more ready to sanction expenditure on the institution, if the collection were so shown and located as to attract marked public attention and approval. We are convinced that the manner, in which the National Portrait Gallery has been unfortunately treated in these respects, has caused serious injury to its

\* 'Notes and Queries,' April 2nd, 1864. Mr. Scharf further states, that 'only a few parts of the face have been retouched with a reddish paint. Some portions of the hair seem to have been darkened, and a few touches of deep madder red may have been added to give point to the nostril and eyelids.' Besides the Chandos Shakspeare the National Collection possesses the well-known engraved portrait of the poet by Droeshout, and a cast of the face from his monument in the Church of Stratford-on-Avon. These three portraits possess peculiarities of features in common, and may be said to confirm one another.

interests,

interests, and has brought no little discredit upon the nation. For nearly twelve long years it continued to be 'housed'—we cannot say exhibited—in the dark and dingy rooms in Great George Street, which were better fitted for a solicitor's chambers or for a surveyor's office than for the exhibition of pictures.

Year after year in their annual reports the Trustees made piteous appeals to the Government for proper space to exhibit the collection of portraits confided to their care, which was daily increasing and daily exciting greater public interest. Four years after the foundation of the institution, in an official letter to the Treasury, they represented 'in the strongest terms' the inadequacy of the space at their disposal for properly hanging the 139 portraits, which they had already acquired by purchase out of the funds granted to them by Parliament, and through the generous gifts of private individuals. For their exhibition they possessed, they stated, only 'two apartments of very moderate size, a very small back room on the same floor, and the walls of the staircase,'\* and that consequently no place had been found for the great picture, by Hayter, of the House of Commons, presented by the Government in 1858. . Not only these rooms, but the entrance-hall as well as the staircase—we are not sure that the cellars and attics were not included—were soon filled with portraits. The Director, in his Report for 1870, describes the pictures 'as crowded closely together, and consigned to some narrow passage, some unsightly corner, or some dark recess.' In the favoured climate of London they were almost entirely invisible during four or five months of the year, and were certainly not improved in condition as works of art by the foul and smoke-laden atmosphere in which they were enveloped. Even at other times they could with difficulty be seen. Old London houses are not specially fitted for the display of pictures, either as regards light or other requirements. Nearly ten years from the opening of the Gallery the Trustees, in their annual report, after again alluding to 'the narrowness and inconvenience in all respects of the apartments,' state that they 'are debarred from all attempts at arrangement or classification of the present pictures, and from all power to place them in favourable lights, and have no space remaining for such accessions as they may continue to receive.' Mr. Scharf had informed the Trustees, in 1868, that 'nothing now remains for the accommodation of future acquisitions but the dark and very limited wall-space of the hall, on the ground-floor, immediately connected with the street-door.'†

---

\* Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery for 1862.

† See Reports for these years presented to Parliament.

The visitors who flocked to the Gallery in crowds, especially on holidays, elbowed each other on the narrow staircase and in the ignoble rooms, to the imminent danger of the pictures. It is to the no small credit of the British public that, under such circumstances, Mr. Scharf was able to report that they had suffered no damage. We have a lively recollection of the sense of shame we experienced, when taking the intelligent and enquiring foreigner to visit our National Portrait Gallery, and of the many ingenious subterfuges, to which we had recourse, to give something like plausible reasons for the shameful neglect with which this important national institution was treated.

The appeals of the Trustees for space, and for a proper building, were made in vain until Lord John Manners, when First Commissioner of Works in 1870, took compassion on the National Portrait Gallery, and provided quarters for it in the South Kensington Museum. To that vast conglomeration of buildings—a very harlequin of architecture in its external as well as internal aspect—every imaginable thing, of which the Government is at a loss to dispose of, has been for long, and is still, relegated. It is perhaps fortunate that so gigantic a warehouse exists—ready to receive every conceivable object, from a cast of Trajan's column to the microscopic analysis of a drop of water.

At any rate, the galleries at South Kensington, which hospitably gave shelter to the National Portraits, were preferable to the soot- and dust-begrimed rooms, entrance-hall, staircase, and unsightly corners, in Great George Street. The pictures could, at least, be seen, could be arranged in something like chronological order, and could be studied and even copied, although it was forbidden to do so in oil—sketches of them in water-colours being only allowed.\* The crowd had elbow-room, and our intelligent foreign friend could, at least, be persuaded that England had a National Portrait Gallery, that her annals were not entirely deficient in great men, and that those of whom she could boast did not all live exactly at the same period, as he might have been led to believe from the manner in which their portraits had been previously jumbled up together.

The good result of removing the Gallery to the South Kensington galleries was immediately apparent. The number of visitors to it rose at once to 58,913, being an excess of 34,497 on the previous year. Although increased room had thus been obtained for the exhibition of the collection, and the Director was able, in a certain measure, to classify the pictures,

\* This somewhat absurd regulation has, we believe, only very recently been abolished.

additional space was soon urgently required. Moreover, the quarters assigned to it and the arrangements made for its reception were lamentably ill-suited for the purpose.

As the collection went on increasing we find the Trustees still repeatedly remonstrating, in their annual reports, on the absence of means for its proper exhibition and on the danger to which it was exposed from fire and other causes. In 1873 they reported that

'want of space, both for pictures and for sculpture, was again beginning to make itself severely felt; many of the portraits being of necessity placed so high on the walls as to be no longer distinguished with clearness. Full-length portraits were placed against the end walls at each extremity of the Gallery, without any regard to chronological order.'

In 1874 they complained that the entrance to the Gallery was so bad and inconvenient that it had caused a very considerable falling off in the number of visitors.\* In 1880 they stated that it was even dangerous. In order to meet the requirements of the International Exhibition at South Kensington 'the principal doorway had been kept fast closed, and the foot of the main staircase barricaded!' The public was 'compelled to make a considerable circuit along a narrow wooden passage, and finally to ascend a staircase, which had at first been before them in a direct line with the entrance from the main road!'

In consequence of these repeated protests and remonstrances on the part of the Trustees, fresh galleries were at length grudgingly added to those which had been at first placed at their disposal. Considering that the building was of a mere temporary nature, and that it was altogether unworthy, in an architectural point of view, of the purpose to which it was turned, the pictures were on the whole fairly well exhibited—the light being generally good—although, as the collection rapidly increased, there was not sufficient hanging space for them. On Bank holidays and other occasions when the number of visitors was greater than usual, adequate arrangements could be made for their admission and exit. At South Kensington, as in Great George Street, even on the most crowded days, no damage whatever appears to have been done to any picture, and the conduct of persons of all classes, who were freely admitted, gave no cause of complaint.

The buildings, or rather sheds, at South Kensington to which the National Portrait Gallery had been transferred, were constructed entirely of wood, and were consequently exposed to

\* The falling off amounted to above 7000 persons. See Report for 1874.

serious risk from fire. In 1874 the Trustees called the attention of the Government to this danger. Rooms adjoining those in which the already priceless collection of National Portraits was placed were, they stated, used 'for the storage of provisions by Messrs. Spiers and Pond of the International Exhibition.' The further bright and original idea had occurred to the authorities who had the arrangement of this Exhibition, to place, in immediate contact with the Gallery containing the portraits, 'stoves used for cooking and heating purposes!'

Although continued and urgent representations were made, through the press, by persons interested in the National Portrait Gallery, and by the public at large, as well as by the Trustees in their annual reports, as to the danger to which it was thus exposed, no adequate attempt was made to guard against it. In 1880 the Trustees brought to the notice of the Government the fact, as deserving 'prompt consideration,' that the low narrow passage forming the only approach to the Portrait Gallery was

'constructed entirely of wood, with weather-boarding for the sides, raised upon piles of wood, which are exposed to all kinds of mischief from the outside—among these piles rubbish and broken packing-cases, paper and straw, have been allowed to accumulate. These passages,' they added, 'are not only unsightly in themselves, but are placed in dangerous contiguity with other wooden buildings, close below certain apertures in the walls of the National Portrait Gallery. A single spark struck by one of the crowd of visitors passing through these passages to evening concerts at the Albert Hall, might in a few moments reduce the Gallery and its contents to a heap of ruins.'

Some precautions, although of a very inadequate nature, were at last taken against the danger of fire, of which the Government was thus persistently warned. Iron doors were in some instances substituted for the ordinary hinged doors of wood, and the western side of the wooden sheds, containing the adjacent Indian Museum, was faced with walls of brick. Nevertheless the catastrophe anticipated by the Trustees was very nearly occurring in the following year. They had already pointed out the risk arising from the 'nearness of a brick flue to a wooden platform and spiral staircase of wood in connection with it and the picture galleries above.' One of their number, the late Mr. Beresford Hope, in a speech in the House of Commons in 1878, humorously described how a department of cookery, with a furnace, 'everything being ready for a bonfire, had been placed just under their rooms.' Their worst apprehensions were very nearly being fulfilled. They reported that early on the morning of Friday, 28th January (1881),

'the

'the flue to which they had directed the attention of the Government became red-hot, and set fire to inflammable materials accumulated round the base of it, in communication with a wooden platform that extended to the flooring of the lower western gallery and the foot of a spiral staircase before mentioned. Happily the watchman at the moment of perceiving a dense smoke gave alarm, and by prompt assistance of the Museum officials the fire was checked.'

The Trustees then made the very modest request, that the chimney shaft and furnace used to warm, not only the Portrait Gallery, but other sheds occupied by the 'omnium gatherum' collections of the South Kensington Museum, might be placed apart from the building itself.

On the 12th of June, 1885, another fire of a very alarming nature broke out in the International Exhibition building, not sixty yards from the National Portrait Gallery, and destroyed a large portion of that part of the Indian Museum which was next to it. That the Gallery itself was not also destroyed was almost a miracle. Had the wind blown in a contrary direction, it would in all probability have been entirely consumed with its contents. This conflagration, and an official report from Captain Shaw, stating that the condition of the building as regards safety from fire was 'deplorable,' fortunately had the effect of arousing public attention to the imminent danger to which an institution, which had become one of great popular interest and national value, had been exposed. Public opinion was brought to bear upon the Government, and a hasty resolution was come to by the First Commissioner of Works to remove the whole collection of portraits to the branch establishment of the Science and Art Department at Bethnal Green—the authorities of the South Kensington Museum having condescended to accept it *on loan* for two years—where it is as much out of the reach of the general public, and especially of the student, as if it had been transferred to Kamtchatka, and where it affords no attraction whatever to the surrounding population. The Galleries which contain it are usually, of a day, absolutely empty, and the annual returns of the visitors to the Museum show that they have not increased since its removal.\*

Although it is to be hoped that the National Portrait Gallery is now somewhat better protected against danger from fire than it was at South Kensington, it appears to be still exposed to

\* Lord Lamington, himself a Trustee, when calling attention in the House of Lords, on the 28th May last, to the position of the National Portrait Gallery, very pertinently remarked that by its removal to Bethnal Green 'great injustice was done to those families who had given pictures to that most interesting and valuable collection, which was now really lost in a general museum, the visitors to which took little interest in historical portraits.'

injury from other causes. The building, or at least that part of it in which the collection is placed, is not properly protected against the effects of weather. During the heavy snow-storms of the winter of 1886-87 the water penetrated through crevices in its walls, and several pictures, we believe, sustained damage. Moreover, the space allotted to the portraits is inadequate and will not permit of a proper and instructive classification and arrangement of them. Although they have separate galleries assigned to them in the upper part of the edifice, they only form part of that jumble of miscellaneous objects, which usually constitute what is somewhat humorously called a 'Fine Art Museum.' We might pass this over, as their removal to Bethnal Green is stated to be a merely temporary measure, if we had any hopes that a proper building would within reasonable time be provided for their permanent reception. But alas! we are again met by the difficulties, indecision and delays, which seem destined to obstruct and frustrate every endeavour to deal in an adequate and fitting manner with a public institution of this nature. After endless discussions, suggestions, and abortive plans, the question of the site of the National Portrait Gallery appears to be as far removed from settlement as ever.

When Lord Stanhope proposed, in the House of Lords, the formation of a collection of the portraits of men and women distinguished in English history, he suggested that such a collection might be appropriately added to the National Gallery of Pictures. This idea has been recently revived; but such an arrangement is open to very serious objections. In the first place, the building-ground now at the disposal of the Government, and likely to be so hereafter, for the extension of the National Gallery, is absolutely required for its present and future wants; and, in the second place, the objects of the two institutions are so entirely different and distinct that it would be most undesirable to place them under the same direction and management, and, if they were contained in the same building, it would be difficult to separate them in this respect.

We are decidedly of opinion, and on this point we are, we have reason to believe, in accord with those who have studied the question, and who are best able to form a judgment upon it, that the national collection of portraits—a collection which from its nature admits of almost indefinite extension—should be placed in an edifice specially constructed for its exhibition, and capable of future enlargement. Several sites have been proposed for it. The present First Commissioner of Works, Mr. Plunket, at one time, it is understood, recommended to the Government the vacant space to the south of the vast mass of public



public buildings facing Parliament Street, and immediately opposite that part of it which contains the Indian department. This suggestion apparently met with general approval. The site offers many advantages. It is central, and of easy access. The position is as favourable as any position in the heart of London can be, as regards the deleterious effect of its smoke-and-gas-charged atmosphere. The ground appertains to the Government, and is sufficiently extensive to allow of the construction of a handsome and suitable edifice, and could, we believe, admit of further extension—a matter of considerable importance. But this idea has, for some reason, been abandoned, and other sites have been mentioned. A place, it has been urged, should be found for the Gallery adjacent to the South Kensington Museum, to which, by some law as absolute as that of Newton, all public institutions appear to gravitate. The Embankment has been suggested; but, unfortunately, the time has passed when that splendid site might have been used for the embellishment of the Metropolis, and might have been devoted to its most sumptuous public edifices.\* Again, it has been proposed to acquire the block of buildings adjoining the National Gallery in Pall Mall East. This would also be an excellent central position—very suitable for the purpose; but it is doubtful whether the ground could be obtained at a reasonable cost, and we should be assured, moreover, that Trafalgar Square is no longer to be the favoured scene of tumultuous meetings and political demonstrations. Other suggestions have been made; but none, as far as we are aware, free from serious and perhaps insurmountable objections. On the whole, we are inclined to think, that the best and most practicable course would be to revert to Mr. Plunket's original proposal, and to erect a building on the vacant space opposite the India Office.

But the essential thing is that some decision should be speedily come to, and that an appropriate and final resting-place should be found for the collection of National Portraits, which has now, as we shall show, attained to very great value and importance. The galleries at Bethnal Green were only lent to the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery for two years. That term has expired, and we presume that the

\* We believe that both the general public and the legal profession are now convinced, that a very grave and irremediable error was committed, when the scheme for the erection of the Law Courts on the Embankment was rejected, principally in consequence of an interested agitation promoted by certain lawyers. A Committee of the House of Commons threw it out by a majority of one vote only. An opportunity, which can never occur again, was thus lost, of adding an architectural embellishment to London, which would have surpassed in grandeur that of any other city of Europe.

authorities of South Kensington Museum would have the right to turn their lodgers, with their property, into the street, in case they required the premises for other objects. Considering the manner in which the National Portraits have already been dealt with, we might one morning hear of the likenesses of our greatest men in Houndsditch, or in some equally suitable quarters in an Israelitish suburb! Questions on the subject have been recently asked in Parliament, and the usual answer given, that 'the matter was under consideration.' The Trustees, as they somewhat sarcastically put it in their last report, 'have had to acknowledge the latest intimation from Her Majesty's Treasury, that the question of a site for the new Gallery "will not be lost sight of,"' which of course means that the Government is as much at sea in the matter as ever.

When the question of site has been settled—if so desirable a result should ever be arrived at—it is of the greatest importance that the building itself should be designed with special view to the proper exhibition and arrangement of the pictures which it is meant to contain, and should be one capable of enlargement upon the same plan when the increasing number of portraits requires it. We trust that the mistake which has been committed in the construction of the National Gallery will not be repeated, and that the new edifice, wherever it may be placed, will not be a patchwork unsuited to the purpose for which it is intended, and deficient in architectural symmetry and grace. The interior should be distributed so that the portraits may be properly classified and arranged, and the collection thus made as useful and instructive as possible, and creditable to the nation. It is also absolutely necessary that the Trustees, as they themselves suggest,\* should be consulted 'as to the plans, extent, arrangement, and character, of the structure.' It was the neglect of this very obvious duty on the part of those who are responsible for the National Gallery, which led to the grave mistakes that were committed with respect to it. It may reasonably be supposed that the Trustees and Director are the persons most competent to prescribe to the architect the nature of the building which they require for the exhibition of the pictures in their keeping, and that an architect should conform himself in this respect to their views and instructions.

That the National Portrait Gallery fully deserves the support of the Government and of the public, is proved by the general interest which it has excited. Within three years of its opening the Trustees were able to report, that the number of visitors had

---

\* See their Report for 1886.

more than doubled—having risen from 5305 in 1859 to 10,907 in 1861.\* The collection during that period had only been accessible to the public at first for two, and afterwards for three days in the week, and tickets, to be obtained from certain printsellers in the Metropolis, were required for admission. When the collection was removed in 1870 to South Kensington, and was opened six days in the week—three on payment of 6*d.*, without any other restriction—the number of visitors rose at once in one year from 24,757 to 58,913. It attained in 1883—the year of the International Fisheries Exhibition—to 146,187.

It is a remarkable fact that, from the time of the opening of the Gallery to its removal to Bethnal Green, no injury of any description appears to have been done to the pictures, although on some occasions, such as Bank holidays and at Easter time, the galleries were inconveniently thronged by visitors—chiefly from the working classes. Nothing could be more encouraging to those who have advocated the opening of such institutions freely to the public, than the testimony borne in his annual reports by Mr. Scharf, who was in the habit of mingling with the crowd, to the good conduct of those composing it, and to the interest shown by them in the portraits. In 1863 he stated that ‘many young lads and factory boys were among the visitors,’ and ‘from first to last every one was quiet and well behaved.’ In 1868 he remarked that he was forcibly struck by ‘the intelligent observations made by some who were mere children and by many working lads, apparently from factories and printing establishments. Some of the younger visitors warned one another that nothing was to be touched; and the police reported that no attempt to finger anything had been observed.’

They do not seem to have required the reminder, that an eminent collector of engravings found himself not unfrequently under the necessity of giving to his fashionable visitors—that ‘they had not eyes in their fingers.’ Many of the portraits attracted their liveliest attention. On one occasion Mr. Scharf reported, that there was a little crowd round the ‘Chandos Shakspeare’ all day long, it being the tercentenary of the poet’s birth (1864):—

‘There were many children, even charity children, and those belonging to the humblest classes, and it was quite striking to observe how quickly they caught at the name of Shakspeare. I was quite surprised to find,’ he added, ‘the ready knowledge which many of the visitors brought to bear on reading the names affixed to the pictures. Many of our visitors were working men, very many were printers.’

---

\* See their Report for 1862.

On another occasion (1868) he reports that

'The fine portrait of the Prince Consort commanded a large share of public attention; and the portrait of Bruce, the Abyssinian traveller, was eagerly enquired for.'

In 1871 a newly-acquired portrait of Sir Walter Scott proved 'a great success.' There was a little crowd 'to look at it all the day long.' A portrait of Dr. Jenner, 'although placed very high and in an unfavourable light, did not escape frequent observation. A woman pointing to it, said to her girls, "Here's the one that's making such a lot of children suffer now for vaccination."' The portraits of Queen Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots attracted a good deal of notice, as did that of Lord Lovat.

'I conversed,' Mr. Scharf wrote (in 1871), 'with several persons who seemed more than ordinarily attentive. One roughly-dressed man surprised me by reading specimens of handwriting to his daughter (a collection of autographs had been added to the portraits). I found out afterwards that he was a journeyman printer. Another, an ivory turner, with his three sons, spoke with great enthusiasm of "this good-sense kind of recreation."'

Mr. Scharf and the Trustees had done their utmost to make the collection instructive as well as attractive. When it was in Great George Street it was, at first, customary to distribute gratuitously printed lists of the portraits it contained. Owing to the great increase in the number of visitors, and the publication of an abridged catalogue at the low price of 6*d.*, this practice was discontinued. Moreover, labels were affixed to each portrait, with the name of the person whose likeness it is, the dates of his birth and death, and the principal deeds or qualities for which he was distinguished. This excellent practice has proved of the greatest advantage. The visitor can now learn, without referring to the catalogue, what it is most necessary for him to know. An attentive walk through the Gallery is a useful lesson, easily and pleasantly learnt, in the history of England in its various branches; it will become even more so when the pictures can be properly classified.\* We know of no place where parents can take their children with greater profit. The remembrance of the great men who have borne a distinguished part in the history of their country will be impressed upon their minds, and will enable them, as Mr. Carlyle wrote, 'to conceive for themselves what manner of fact and man this or the other historical name can have been.'

We may add, that the catalogue of the entire collection,

\* No classification whatever is now attempted at Bethnal Green.

compiled by Mr. Scharf, is a manual of English history and adds greatly to the value of the Gallery. It is in every respect what such a catalogue should be, and does the highest credit to its author. The description of each portrait is accompanied by a short biography of the person represented, giving in concise terms, in the case of historical characters, a summary of the principal events with which their names are connected; and in the case of men of letters and of science and of artists, mentioning their principal works and discoveries. To the descriptive part of the catalogue is added a necrological list of the persons whose portraits are comprised in the collection, and brief notices of the various painters by whom they were executed.

In deciding whether a portrait is to be admitted into the National Portrait Gallery two things are to be considered—first, the claim that the person may have to a place in it, and secondly, its authenticity. As regards the first consideration, it will be remembered that Lord Stanhope, when advocating the formation of the Gallery, laid it down as a general rule, that the portrait of no one should be in it of whom it might be asked ‘Who is he?’ In principle this rule may be just and reasonable, but it is evident that it cannot be acted upon to the full extent. Lord Ellenborough, a man of high culture, in his speech in support of Lord Stanhope’s resolution, did not hesitate to admit, that there were many men distinguished in their day who might deserve to be perpetuated, but with whose names he was unacquainted. And such is probably the case with most people. We are of opinion that, on the whole, the selection has been judiciously made, and that the portraits as far as they go—for the collection is, of course, as yet far from complete—give a very fair representation of the leading personages in all branches of English history, in politics, war, literature, science, and art. We might, perhaps, object to a lady being admitted whose only claim to notoriety is that she was the mother of an illegitimate child by Charles II., and to some other ladies who have not even this claim to celebrity; but we do not desire to be hypercritical or ungallant.

The Trustees have faithfully adhered to the rule they laid down, that in the selection of portraits they would not be influenced by any political bias; and that a portrait which might be valuable as illustrating the civil, ecclesiastical, or literary, history of the country, would not be rejected because of any great faults or errors attributable, by general admission, to the original. We have thus Guy Fawkes, Titus Oates, Dr. Dodd, Judge Jeffreys, Lord Lovat, Wilkes, Horne Tooke, and Lady Hamilton, finding places amongst the most illustrious and virtuous

virtuous of their countrymen and countrywomen. Criminals only notorious for their crimes are, however, more suitable to the dismal vaults of Madame Tussaud. The rule, that the portraits of no living person except those of the reigning sovereign, and of his or her consort, and of persons comprised in a group or series, should be included in the collection, has also been strictly adhered to. We could have wished for a likeness of the Queen by a British artist representing the art of her reign at its best.\* No portrait of any person deceased within less than ten years is to be admitted, if three of the Trustees should state their dissent. We may number as having been received under this rule those of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord Macaulay, Faraday, Dickens, and Cobden. No one will probably be disposed to question their claim to the honour. It was wise to lay down the further rule, that no portrait should be accepted as a gift (or bequest, we presume) unless approved by three-fourths, at least, of the Trustees present at a meeting. Without a strict adherence to this regulation, the collection might run a grave risk of being over-stocked with portraits of persons who were more deserving of the honour of being included in it in their own estimation, or in that of their families, than in the opinion of others.

In determining the authenticity of a portrait, when sufficient proofs of its genuineness are not forthcoming, no inconsiderable historical and archeological knowledge and experience are required, and they are both eminently possessed by Mr. Scharf. They have been of the greatest service, not only to the Trustees, but to the public, in the selection of the portraits which form the National Collection. Unfortunately those of many persons of eminence and celebrity, who have lived even in recent times, can no longer be identified with absolute certainty. Their names were not inscribed upon the canvas or panel, as they ought to have been when they were painted, or the inscription may belong to a later period, and may even be a modern forgery. It should be impressed upon the owners of portraits that none should, if possible, be left without the means of identification. Either the name of the original should be written on the face of the picture itself, or on a label which can be attached without risk of injury to it,† and where it is not liable to be removed. The features of a man or woman, unless distinguished by some striking and notorious pecu-

\* That of Her Majesty is a copy by Lady Abercromby of a picture by von Angeli, although, according to another rule, no modern copy of an original picture should be admitted into the collection.

† It must be remembered that a paper label pasted, or otherwise attached to the back of the canvas, may cause serious injury to the picture by producing a corresponding patch or mark on the face of it.

liarity,

liarity, can rarely be remembered and recognized after two, or the utmost, three generations. Our country houses and the mansions of our nobility abound in unknown portraits, the identification of which too often depends upon mere guesswork, or upon some untrustworthy family tradition. Horace Walpole complained that

'portraits that cost twenty, thirty, sixty guineas'—what would he have said of the prices of our days?—'and that proudly take possession of the drawing-room, give way in the next generation to those of the new-married couple, descending into the parlour, where they are slightly mentioned as *my father's and mother's pictures*. When they become *grandfather and grandmother* they mount to the two pair of stairs, and then, unless dispatched to the mansion-house in the country, or crowded into the house-keeper's room, they perish away among the lumber of garrets, or flutter in rags before a broker's shop in the Seven Dials.'

Before the eighteenth century the name of the person represented was rarely inscribed upon a portrait. The date of his birth, his coat of arms, and the year in which the picture was painted, were however frequently given, and the skill of the expert or connoisseur is proved by his ability to identify the portrait by such indications. Written descriptions by persons competent to make them, especially if contemporaries of the original, afford most effective means of identification and of discovering names. The catalogue of the pictures belonging to Charles I., drawn up by Vander Doort in 1639, containing brief notes, such as 'in red,' 'in harness,' 'side face,' 'half a figure,' &c., has been of the greatest utility in this respect.

When no trustworthy written or oral evidence can be furnished to establish the authenticity of a portrait, especially of ancient date, its genuineness may be tested by certain indications, or sometimes by apparently very unimportant details, which furnish conclusive proof on the subject to a student of history and to the archæologist. For instance, the dress of the person supposed to be represented may not be that of the period in which he lived; it may even differ from it in some minute particulars, only to be detected by an experienced and skilled antiquary. On the other hand, the original of a portrait may be ascertained by some distinctive mark, as by the order of knighthood which he wears, by a quartering in his coat of arms, by a motto, by some striking peculiarity in the features, or by some event or allusion introduced into the background. By such tests as we have indicated, and by his knowledge of the styles of art of different periods, Mr. Scharf has been able to identify more than one important and interesting portrait,  
and



and to reject the claims of others to authenticity. We may mention as instances, amongst many, the picture at Hampton Court, at one time believed to represent the three children of Henry VII. of England, but now proved to be those of Christian II., King of Denmark; an interesting picture at Sherborne Castle, Dorsetshire, which he has shown to represent Queen Elizabeth in a litter proceeding to the marriage of Anne Russell at Blackfriars, in June 1600, but previously thought to refer to a visit paid by the Queen to Lord Hunsdon;\* and the portrait of the Countess of Pembroke, 'Sydney's sister, Pembroke's mother,' supposed before it came to the Gallery to be that of the Countess of Somerset.†

We also owe to Mr. Scharf the identification of the fine picture now in the Gallery, representing the Conference held in London in 1604, for the Ratification of the Treaty for Peace and Commerce between England and Spain, containing the portraits of five eminent English noblemen, and of six Commissioners for the King of Spain, and the Archdukes of Austria, who acted as Plenipotentiaries on the occasion. It was, moreover, his artistic knowledge which enabled him to establish, that the name of the Spanish painter, Pantoja de la Cruz, inscribed on the picture, was a forgery, and to assign the work to its true author, Mark Gheeraedts. Many cases may even be mentioned where portraits have been purposely altered to represent different and very opposite characters. Such frauds are easily detected when the picture is subjected to the cleaning process, and the over-paint is removed. We have known a much-valued portrait of Shakspeare to be converted by these means into that of a Spanish Saint.‡

Artistic merit is no test for the admission of a portrait into the National Portrait Gallery. What is required is, that it

\* See his paper on 'The Visit of Queen Elizabeth to Blackfriars in 1600,' *Archæological Journal*, vol. xxiii.

† Pictures themselves are too frequently misinterpreted, and unfortunately engravers (without necessarily intending fraud) create and perpetuate such errors. Thus in the engraving from the Hampton Court picture of the three children of Christian II. of Denmark, the eldest boy has been accepted as Arthur, Prince of Wales, and as such copied on a panel in the Prince's Chamber at the Palace of Westminster. In like manner a German picture of Anne of Hungary, wife of Ferdinand, Emperor of Germany, and half-sister of Charles V., with 'Anna Regina, 1530,' and other dates sufficiently conclusive upon it, has been engraved as 'Anne Boleyn,' and as such copied in another compartment of the same chamber. Yet several authentic portraits of Anne Boleyn exist in the royal and other collections.

‡ Mr. Scharf gave several instances of these fraudulent changes in engravings, in a lecture delivered in 1866 at the Royal Institution, e.g., Archbishop Leighton, of the time of Charles I., was turned into Horne Tooke; Coleridge, the poet, into Lord Cochrane; Incedon, the singer, into Greenacre, the murderer, &c.

should

should be authentic, and that it gives a fair representation, as far as can be ascertained, of the features of the original. Thus, whilst the collection contains many portraits of great value as works of art by such renowned painters as Sir Antonio More, Mytens, Van Dyck, Kneller, Reynolds, and Gainsborough, it comprises, on the other hand, some by very inferior artists, which, in vulgar phrase, might be denounced as daubs, and others so much repainted as to retain but few traces of the hand of the painter. The visitor must, therefore, recollect that it does not claim his attention as a collection of works of art, but that it is strictly what it purports to be—a collection of portraits, the best, and frequently the only ones that can be obtained, of Englishmen and Englishwomen, who are in any way distinguished in the annals of their country, or whose likenesses, for any special reason, may be of interest to any class of the public. Portraits of great men by great painters are rare, and if offered, either publicly or privately, for sale, command prices far beyond the limited means of the Trustees, who have only the annual Parliamentary grant of 2000*l.* to depend upon, unless the Government of the day is sufficiently liberal and public-spirited to place at their disposal additional funds, as in the instance of the highly-important and valuable picture, to which we have already referred, representing the ‘*Ratification of the Treaty for Peace and Commerce between England and Spain*,’ purchased at the Duke of Hamilton’s sale in 1882 for 2520*l.*—the largest sum hitherto paid by them for a single picture.

The price of portraits by celebrated painters has risen so much of late years in consequence of the competition for them, not confined to English collectors, that Mr. Scharf had to report in 1886, that during the previous year no addition had been made to the Gallery by purchase, such portraits as were desirable for the collection having been sold at prices ‘not at all commensurate with the funds at the disposal of the Trustees.’ Valuable works have, however, in some instances been obtained by them on moderate terms. For Sir Joshua Reynolds’s portrait of Burke, which was sold at Christie’s in 1874 for 1000 guineas, only 500*l.* were paid in the same auction rooms by the Trustees in 1881. They secured those of Lord Keppel and the Earl of Bath, by the same great painter, for 400*l.* each;\* one of Sir Thomas Gresham, by Sir Antonio More, for 262*l.* 10*s.*; one of Sir Kenelm Digby, by Van Dyck, for 150*l.*; and a rare portrait of James II., by Sir Godfrey Kneller, for 110*l.* 5*s.*

\* For the portrait of Blackstone, also by Reynolds, they paid only 157*l.* 10*s.*; but it was in bad condition, and almost entirely repainted.

It is only since 1863 that the prices paid by the Trustees have been regularly recorded in their reports. They have been for the most part very reasonable, and it may be confidently stated that the annual grant has been judiciously and economically spent.\*

Having thus traced the history of the National Portrait Gallery, and described its management, we shall proceed to show how far it has justified the anticipations of its founders, and how far it deserves the continued support of the public and the Government. The collection now consists of about 800 portraits acquired by purchase, donation, and bequest, including drawings, busts in marble, bronze, and terra-cotta, medallions, enamels, engravings, and casts from effigies on tombs, mostly of royal personages, from the twelfth to the sixteenth century.† Many of them have been gifts or loans from public institutions. Thus the Trustees of the British Museum have transferred to the National Portrait Gallery the greater part of a valuable collection of portraits, which had previously been hung well out of sight above cases containing stuffed specimens of natural history. Among them were several of high historical interest and rarity—for instance, a small full-length figure of Chaucer, a somewhat rude painting, probably by an English artist, which there are good reasons for believing to be genuine. Among English sovereigns were portraits of Richard II., Henry V., Henry VI., Queen Elizabeth, James I., Charles II., William III., and George I.; and among celebrated and distinguished men, those of the Earl of Arundel, Bacon, Burghley, Camden, Archbishop Cranmer, Locke, the Duke of Marlborough, the Duke of Monmouth, Sir Isaac Newton, Pope, Prior, Algernon Sydney, Archbishop Ussher, and others of minor interest, including several unknown persons, who probably may some day be identified. In 1883, the Trustees of the National Gallery transferred by way of loan to the National Portrait Gallery seventeen

\* Portraits, unless by very distinguished painters, have at no time fetched very large sums. So late as 1850 many of no little interest were sold from Lord Beauchamp's collection for such ridiculously small sums as 3*l.* 18*s.* for one of Steele, by Kneller; 8½ guineas for one of Ben Jonson; 4½ guineas for one of Congreve, also by Kneller, now in the National Portrait Gallery; and 8½ guineas for one of Dean Swift, by Jervas. Mr. Scharf, in his 'Notes on the National Portrait Gallery' (Companion to the Almanac for 1871), mentions the low prices paid, at sales, in the last century, for portraits of great value, as well for their artistic merits as for their historical interest. For instance, for one of Rowe, 1*l.* 5*s.*; of Spenser, 2*l.* 6*s.*; of Shakspeare, 2*l.* 2*s.*; and of Cowley, 3*l.* 15*s.* The magnificent group of Sir Kenelm Digby, his wife and children, by Van Dyck, now in the possession of the Duke of Portland, was bought in at 175*l.* 5*s.*!

† In addition to the portraits, &c., the National Portrait Gallery possesses a collection of autographs—solely the gift of private individuals—but it is neither very extensive, important, nor select.

portraits, of no great importance as works of art, with the exception of a full-length of Sir William Hamilton by Reynolds, and as consequently better suited to the latter collection. They were chiefly those of eminent artists, and actors and actresses, including John Kemble, Mrs. Siddons, and John Fawcett; but they comprised an interesting portrait of Milton. Two suppressed legal institutions have also contributed their respective collections of portraits to the National Portrait Gallery—the Honourable Society of Judges and Sergeants-at-Law, and ‘the Principal and Antients’ of Barnard’s Inn.

The good example set by these institutions might, we think, be followed with much advantage in the case of Hampton Court Palace. In its miscellaneous collection of pictures there are several portraits of great historical interest and value which, as pointed out by Lord Stanhope, would be a very important addition to the National Portrait Gallery—as there are also in it many pictures by the old masters which would add to the completeness of the Gallery in Trafalgar Square. They are almost lost where they now are, and their removal would scarcely cause a blank or detract in any material manner from its interest. We might further insist, as we have before done, on the danger of destruction by fire to which they are exposed. In 1883 Mr. Watts generously presented to the Gallery his three fine and highly characteristic portraits of Lord Lyndhurst, Admiral Lord Lyons, and Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and other artists and owners of pictures have liberally contributed to the collection, and we earnestly hope that others may be induced to do the same.

For a full necrological list of the portraits of eminent and famous persons, now included in the National Portrait Gallery, we must refer our readers to Mr. Scharf’s catalogue. From it we learn that the earliest portrait, or rather effigy, in the collection is that of Robert Duke of Normandy, surnamed Courthose, the eldest son of William the Conqueror, who died in 1106. It is an electrotype from the recumbent figure in wood on his monument in Gloucester Cathedral. The series of English kings commences with Henry III., of whom there is an electrotype from his bronze effigy in Westminster Abbey. Representations of his predecessors in any form are wanting. Those of Edward II. and III. follow that of Henry; and are also electrotypes from their monuments in Gloucester Cathedral and Westminster Abbey.\*

---

\* The collection also contains tracings of the wall paintings in St. Stephen’s Chapel, Westminster, representing Edward III. and his family, which unfortunately perished in 1834, when the Houses of Parliament were destroyed by fire.

The first painted royal portrait is that of Richard II. by an unknown artist. The celebrated picture of this king, formerly in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster, and now transferred to the Abbey, might, we think, find a safe and permanent asylum in the National Portrait Gallery, when the institution has becoming quarters in which to receive it. Those of Henry IV., V. and VI. follow—also by unknown painters. In all three the costumes are minutely represented, although the features may be more or less of a conventional character. From Richard III. the series of royal portraits is complete to the present reigning sovereign, with the exception of that of Charles I., of whom the collection only possesses a bust—which, considering the many likenesses of that sovereign existing in England, is somewhat strange—\* and that of Her Majesty's predecessor, William IV., of whom assuredly some representation might be discovered to fill the gap. Of the earlier monarchs between Henry III. and Richard III. only the portraits of Edward I., IV. and V. are wanting.

Of Catharine of Aragon, the Gallery has one portrait, representing her 'with round face, short nose and very thick lips'—features which scarcely accord with the popular notion of the stately and unfortunate Queen, but which are characteristic of the aunt of Charles V.—and one of Anne Boleyn. Of Queen Elizabeth it possesses no less than seven, including an electrotype from her effigy in Westminster Abbey, and one from the fragment of a gold piece preserved in the British Museum—the earliest taken when she was about thirty-four years of age, the latest, attributed to Mark Gheeraedts, when she was advanced in life. She is seen in middle age, yellow-haired, in a likeness attributed to her court painter, Zucharo, and in the well-known miniature by Nicholas Hilliard, painted on the back of a playing card with the Queen of Hearts—an adroit piece of flattery on the part of the artist.

Mary Queen of Scots appears in three portraits—the earliest as the youthful consort of Francis II. and consequently as Queen of France, as shown by the quarterings of the arms of Scotland and France on a shield hanging from a tree. It is an elaborate costume-picture by an unknown painter, with all the details of jewellery done from reality. In the distance is a fortified town on lofty crags—probably Edinburgh, and the device of a column surmounted by a crown is seen between the letters M. R. and

---

\* It is also singular that the portrait of his Queen, Henrietta Maria, doubtfully attributed to Van Dyck, was obtained by the Trustees from Quebec! Yet portraits of her by that painter, or from his workshop, are numerous in England.

other emblems.\* The second, as Queen Dowager in her widow's weeds, is a copy of that by Janet at Hampton Court. The third is that taken whilst she was a prisoner at Sheffield, and dated 1578. It is one of considerable importance, and belonged to Charles I., as is shown by a brand of his crown and C.R. on the back of the panel. It exhibits the characteristics of her features more distinctly than any other portrait taken after her return from France. In addition, the collection possesses her likeness in the cast of a remarkable medallion by Jacopo Primavera, the original of which is not known to exist, and in an electrotype from her monument in Westminster Abbey.†

The Trustees have recently acquired a portrait of the unfortunate Lady Jane Dudley, more generally known by her maiden name of Lady Jane Grey, of which Mr. Scharf, in his report for last year, gives the following interesting description—the more touching as he conjectures that she appears in the dress which she wore during her trial and at the time of her execution.

‘The youthful figure wears a black cloth dress with collar and white fur edging to slashes. A small frill fits round her neck close to the cheek, with a white band below it. Her brown-yellow hair is parted in the middle and gathered in large masses on each side. . . . The pale face is turned slightly to the left, and the chestnut-coloured eyes look calmly at the spectator. The mouth is a pale red, with a very small lip and somewhat compressed.’

Of the Stuarts, we have three portraits of James, the ‘Old Pretender,’ two of his son Charles Edward, the ‘Young Pretender,’ and three of Cardinal York, the last of the house.

The space at our command will not permit us to do more than indicate a few of the portraits of Englishmen distinguished in politics, literature, and science, which will be found in the National Portrait Gallery. We have already mentioned that of Chaucer as having been transferred to it from the British Museum. Wolsey is seen in a contemporary

---

\* Mr. Scharf says of this portrait, ‘that the only difficulty in placing entire reliance in the picture is that in all the absolutely authentic portraits of Mary Queen of Scots, the eyes are deep brown, with a bluish tinge in the whites, whilst here the eyeballs are of a decided blue.’—‘Notes on the National Gallery,’ p. 11. We believe that he is now of opinion that this portrait may possibly be that of Mary of Lorraine, the mother of Mary Queen of Scots, during her Regency of Scotland, as in her famous portrait, with that of James V., in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, her eyes are decidedly blue.

† In the remarkable collection of portraits of Mary Queen of Scots, recently brought together and exhibited at Peterborough, there were some more interesting and important than those in the National Portrait Gallery, which we may express a hope may one day find a place there.

picture in his Cardinal's dress. Of Sir Thomas More, with 'his pale face, dark slaty-grey eyes and eyebrows, dark-brown, broad, and soft,' we have a likeness at the age of forty-seven, taken, it is conjectured, from the original crayon portrait at Windsor Castle, drawn by Holbein from the life, and painted by a pupil of that great master. That of the Earl of Surrey, with moustaches and forked beard of a rich chestnut-colour, smooth and ruddy cheeks, and the collar of the Garter round his neck, corresponds with his chivalric and romantic character. The portraits of the three Protestant martyrs, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, in sombre ecclesiastical costume, are identified by their names inscribed upon them. In striking contrast to them is that of Reginald Pole, as Papal Legate to Queen Mary, in his Cardinal's attire, and with the hat of his dignity surmounting the shield of his arms combined with those of the see of Canterbury. That of John Knox has little to impress the spectator with the fiery and indomitable character of one 'who never feared the face of man.' Essex, the lover and the victim of Queen Elizabeth, in his thirtieth year, appears fitly attired in white satin, with the device of St. George and the Dragon hanging at his breast. Of that Queen's great Minister, Lord Burghley, the Gallery contains two portraits, one, which Mr. Scharf conjectures to be by Mark Gheeraedts, represents the Lord High Treasurer as an old man with white hair, in his robes and with his wand of office.

Among the portraits of the most celebrated personages of the seventeenth century we find that of the great lawyer Sir Edward Coke, attired in his scarlet robes, lace ruff, and black skull-cap, as Lord Chief Justice of the 'Common Bench' (Common Pleas), which, with other portraits of great lawyers, had once adorned the walls of Serjeants' Inn, and those of Lord Keeper Littleton, Sir Mathew Hale, Lord Camden, Lord Tenterden, and Lord Eldon, and of some other luminaries of the law, of whom it might not perhaps be impertinent to ask, 'who were they?'

Of the poets and dramatists in whom this century was so rich, the collection contains besides that of Shakspeare, which we have already described, those of Ben Jonson,\* Fletcher, Drayton, Sir John Suckling, Quarles, Cowley (by an unknown painter, but a remarkable picture), Butler, Waller, and Dryden—the latter holding the laurel-leaves emblematic of his office. Of Milton there are two portraits—the one lent, as we have men-

\* An old copy from one by Gerard Honthorst.



tioned, by the Trustees of the National Gallery; the other the well-known engraving from the life by William Faithorne, in which the poet is represented at the age of sixty-two when totally blind, although there is no indication of the loss of sight. Of the most celebrated philosophers and men of letters of the same period, we have Camden, the antiquary, historian, and scholar; Speed; Cotton, whose famous collection of manuscripts and books now forms one of the most valuable portions of the British Museum; Lord Herbert of Cherbury; Selden; Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, with his 'olivaster (like wainscott) complexion; hair quite white, twenty years before he died,' as he is described by one who knew him;\* Cocker, the accepted authority on domestic arithmetical problems; Harrington, the author of 'Oceana,' painted by Honthorst; Isaac Barrow, the divine; Andrew Marvel, the satirist, 'roundish-faced, cherry-cheek't, hazell eie and browne haire;'; Hobbes, the philosopher, with ample forehead and 'deep-set grey eyes, fixed with a penetrating look upon the spectator;'; John Locke, a characteristic portrait of the great metaphysician; and that martyr to liberty and victim of bloody Jeffreys, Algernon Sydney, who, when he had laid his head on the block and was asked by the executioner whether he would rise again, replied, 'not until the general resurrection; strike on.'

Of John Hampden, the soldier-patriot, the collection has unfortunately no painted portrait; but he is represented in a terra-cotta bust, by an unknown sculptor of uncertain date, in full armour, with long flowing hair falling on both sides of his face. We have, however, the likenesses of Ireton and Lambert, in their black polished breast-plates, by Walker, by whom the National Portrait Gallery also possesses the well-known portrait of Cromwell. Of this great Englishman it contains two others on canvas and two busts, one in terra-cotta and the other in bronze. The collection is, however, deficient in portraits of the men who were famous in the troublous times of the Rebellion and the Commonwealth. We can only add to those whom we have already mentioned the names of Speaker Lenthall, Sir William Waller and Sir Harry Vane.

In the portrait of Prince Rupert we do not recognize the rash and ardent soldier, attired as he is in the robes of the Garter, in one of those conventional pictures which Sir Peter Lely kept ready in stock, and which only required the addition of the face of his sitter.† A noble head of William Lord Russell, the

\* Aubrey, in his 'Letters,' vol. ii. p. 382.

† See note to the portrait in Mr. Scharf's catalogue.

martyr to liberty, is by Riley; and his brave and devoted wife, Lady Rachel, in mourning for her husband, her dark grey eyes 'fixed on the spectator with a mournful expression,' is from the easel of Sir Godfrey Kneller.

Monk is represented in another of Sir Peter Lely's mannered pictures, with the blue ribbon of the Garter across his buff coat, leaning on an anchor and holding the baton of command. By the same painter, and by Wissing, his pupil, are portraits of the unfortunate Duke of Monmouth—with 'a youthful close-shaven face'—and by Kneller, that of the infamous Judge Jeffreys.

The collection, as might be expected, is rich in portraits of the most eminent men of the eighteenth century—some by English painters, which are not less interesting for the persons whom they represent than precious as works of art. A native school of painting had arisen in England, and had produced such masters as Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney, who could portray not only with fidelity, but with the artistic skill required to give the true character of their sitters, the features of the most distinguished men of their time.

Among the generals and statesmen of this period we may mention in the first place the Duke of Marlborough, of whose somewhat weak countenance, little corresponding with his military genius, there are three representations—one by Sir Godfrey Kneller, who has also portrayed the more masculine features of the Duchess Sarah. By the same painter is the portrait of the illustrious Lord Somers. Of Sir Robert Walpole the collection has two likenesses, one by Van Loo, a French artist of some celebrity in his day, in which the Minister is seen in his robes as Chancellor of the Exchequer, wearing a full grey wig and the Order of the Garter; the other by Frank Hayman. By another French painter of greater merit and greater celebrity, Hyacinthe Rigaud, there is a portrait of Lord Bolingbroke in his peer's robes. Lord Clive, to whom England owes her Indian Empire, and whose genius and character have been more justly estimated by posterity than by his contemporaries, deserves the place assigned to him among her first statesmen. Of Warren Hastings, to whom she is indebted for the early development of her same magnificent possession, we have two portraits as Governor-General of India—one, a full-length by Davis, which formerly hung in the Government House at Calcutta—and a third painted in his old age by Sir Thomas Lawrence. Of the Earl of Chatham, the 'great Commoner,' the collection contains but an unworthy likeness by Richard Brompton, a little known and inferior painter, and

of Lord North, of whom there must surely be many authentic portraits, only a small crayon drawing by Nathaniel Dance. Lord Mansfield, the learned and eloquent lawyer, has been more fortunate in having his features handed down to posterity by two painters of exceptional skill; by Copley, the father of one of the Chancellor's most eminent successors, and by Allan Ramsay. Of the two portraits of Burke, belonging to the Trustees, one, by a pupil of Sir Joshua Reynolds, has been lent to the National Gallery of Ireland, which was previously without a likeness of the great Irishman;\* the other is by that eminent painter himself, but as a work of art is inferior in merit to others by him of the statesman and orator in private hands.

It is to be regretted that the collection is deficient in portraits of the famous naval commanders and mariners of the seventeenth century. Of the eighteenth it only possesses those of Dampier, who, although dying in 1712, properly belongs to the previous century, in which some of his most celebrated exploits were performed; of Boscawen, a characteristic likeness by Sir Joshua Reynolds of the Admiral in his old age; of Lord Anson, a copy of the picture by the same painter at Wimpole; of the celebrated navigator and discoverer, Captain Cook, 'with his very dark grey eyes and eyebrows broad and dark,' by John Webber, a member of the Royal Academy, who accompanied him on his last expedition and was present at his death, which forms the subject of one of his pictures; of Admiral Keppel, a fine portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds; of Vancouver and of Lord Howe. Of Nelson, the greatest of our naval heroes, there are two portraits, neither, however, worthy of him. †

---

\* In addition to the well-selected and valuable pictures added by Mr. Henry Doyle to the Irish National Gallery, he has brought together and admirably arranged a very interesting collection of portraits of eminent Irishmen, including an important series of mezzotints recently obtained by the munificence of Lord Ardilaun. We regret that we cannot do more than refer in a note to the highly interesting collection of between two and three hundred portraits which form the Scottish National Portrait Gallery—founded in 1882. A truly liberal and patriotic Scotchman, whose name, we believe, has not been divulged, has given the munificent sum of 30,000*l.* for the erection of a suitable building to contain it. We wish that some wealthy Englishman could be found to follow his example.

† As these sheets are passing through the press we learn, that the National Portrait Gallery has received as a present from the Sultan a small full-length portrait of Lord Nelson, which Lord Nelson had himself given to the Sultan Selim III., in acknowledgment of a present of a magnificent aigrette of diamonds and a rich robe of honour of scarlet cloth lined with cloth, given to the Admiral after the Battle of the Nile, 1798. The picture was painted by Leonardo Guzzardi, of Palermo, in 1799.

We could desire to see in our National Portrait Gallery a larger number of portraits of the sea-captains, to whom England is so much indebted for her greatness, her glories, her reputation amongst the nations, and her command of the seas which has ensured her safety and independence. Such an addition to the collection would be popular among all classes—Englishmen of every degree and condition taking the liveliest interest in the lives and deeds of our seamen. The Gallery does not even contain a portrait of the renowned Drake. We may hope that by pointing out this deficiency we may induce some who possess such portraits to present them to the nation.\*

Of portraits of distinguished men, who flourished during the eighteenth century, and especially of the men of letters who adorned the reign of Queen Anne, the National Portrait Gallery contains a rich, if not a complete, collection. Among the men of science and philosophers there are those of Newton, Sir Hans Sloane, Berkeley, John Hunter,† Watt, whose name is inseparably connected with the application of the greatest of our present motive powers, and Arkwright, the inventor of the spinning-jenny, to whom England mainly owes her commercial prosperity and consequently her wealth; Erasmus Darwin, the features of whose illustrious descendant will, we trust, soon adorn the nineteenth-century series of the national portraits, and Dr. Priestley. Among the writers of this period—the perfecters of our English prose—we may mention Addison, Steele, Richardson, and Goldsmith;‡ among the poets, Prior, Congreve, Pope, Dean Swift, Shenstone, Churchill, Gray, and Burns; among the painters, architects, actors, and musicians, Reynolds, Hogarth, Wilson, Moreland, Sir Christopher Wren (who, however, more properly belongs to the previous century), Sir William Chambers, Garrick, and Handel. Dissenters will contemplate with deserved interest the portraits of Whitefield and Wesley, the former in a flaxen wig and black gown, and ‘with a decided squint’ in his grey eyes, preaching from a pulpit to his congregation; the latter, also in the pulpit, the Bible open before him, with raised ‘pale blue-grey eyes,’ and

\* A series of portraits of Admirals by Kneller, Lely, and other painters, was transferred by George IV. from Hampton Court Palace to Greenwich Hospital.

† A copy by Jackson of the picture by Sir Joshua Reynolds in the College of Surgeons.

‡ Of Dr. Johnson, of whom there must be available portraits, and who deserves a prominent place in the National Portrait Gallery, there is, strange to say, only a modern terra-cotta statuette by J. E. Boehm, R.A.

‘silvery white hair divided in the middle and dressed at the side in a long barrel curl.’\*

We cannot conclude this mention of eighteenth-century portraits without referring to those of two men whom England may be proud to include among her sons, although they renounced their parent—George Washington and Benjamin Franklin. Of the former the collection only possesses an unworthy pastil drawing. The venerable features of the latter were painted in Paris, in 1783, by an Italian artist named Baricolo, of whom nothing else is known.

As we approach our own times, the National Portrait Gallery becomes, as might be expected, more ample and complete. More than two-thirds of the whole collection consists of distinguished persons who have lived in the present century, as far as the ten years’ rule, from which there have been but rare departures, will permit. It is probably for the likenesses of famous statesmen, contemporary with the present generation, and whose features are consequently still familiar to living men, that the majority of visitors will seek, and they will not be disappointed. Of William Pitt, they will only find a marble bust by Nollekens, and a pen-and-ink drawing by Gillray, the caricaturist. The familiar features of his rival Fox are seen in a terra-cotta bust, modelled by the same sculptor. The absence of portraits of these two great statesmen makes a gap in the collection which cannot, we are convinced, be left long unfilled. The somewhat ignoble features of Curran—almost those of the typical Irishman of Donnybrook Fair—offer a strange contrast to his great intellectual gifts. They are, however, lighted up by a bright and eager eye, which marks the character of the impetuous and eloquent orator.

Among the portraits of statesmen who, in the present century, have had the direction of the policy and the administration of the affairs of England, or who have filled an important place in her political annals, we find those of Sheridan, Canning, Huskisson, Sir J. Mackintosh, Daniel O’Connell, Lord Melbourne, Lord George Bentinck, Sir R. Peel, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Lyndhurst, Richard Cobden, Lord Brougham, Lord Palmerston, Lord Russell,† and lastly, Lord

---

\* This picture was painted by William Hamilton, the Royal Academician. Mr. Scharf, in a note to the description of it in the catalogue, has given two highly interesting accounts of this remarkable man, one from the pen of Horace Walpole, the other from the diary of Mr. Crabb Robinson.

† Lord Russell is included among the Members of the House of Commons in the picture by Hayter, and a marble bust of him has been presented to the Gallery by the Duke of Bedford.

Beaconsfield, who is, as yet, only represented in a statuette—an imperfect list, but sufficient to show that the Trustees have faithfully adhered to their rule, of not allowing political opinions to influence them in their selection of portraits for the collection.

Our space will not allow us to do more than indicate the portraits of other eminent and distinguished persons of our time, which have already found a place in the National Portrait Gallery. Suffice it to say, that there are few deceased Englishmen or Englishwomen, of real distinction in literature, in the law, in war, in the arts, and in science, belonging to this century, who are not represented in it. Among our poets and men of letters, Keats, Byron, Scott, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Macaulay, Thackeray, Dickens, and Mrs. Cross (George Eliot); among our painters and sculptors, Flaxman, Lawrence, Stothard, Wilkie, Eastlake, Gibson, and Landseer, but not, we regret to say, Turner, the greatest and most original of them all; among our men of science, who have contributed so greatly to the material prosperity of England, and who have earned a world-wide renown by their discoveries, Rennie, Sir William Herschel,\* Stephenson, Faraday, Buckland, Mrs. Somerville, Brewster, and John Stuart Mill.

It only remains for us to mention, what Mr. Scharf terms 'collective portraits.' We have already referred to the picture representing the 'Conference of the English, Spanish, and Austrian Commissioners for the Ratification of a Treaty between England and Spain.' Guy Fawkes and his seven fellow-conspirators appear in an engraving 'from the life,' by Crispin de Passe. A picture of the seven bishops who were committed to the Tower on the 8th of June, 1688, for refusing to distribute the King's declaration of indulgence for liberty of conscience, represents the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, with his brethren in their white episcopal robes in separate medallions. The painter, who is unknown, has had recourse to the archaic device of denoting the most important personage in the group, by representing the Archbishop on a larger scale than those by whom he is surrounded. A picture by Heckel of the House of Commons in 1793, with ninety-six portraits of the most eminent political men of the time—Pitt addressing the House—was generously presented by the Emperor of Austria. Of equal interest is one by Sir George Hayter of the old House of

---

\* The Gallery is still wanting in a portrait of his illustrious son. We remember a masterly drawing in chalk, of his powerful and striking head, by Mr. Watts, which we should be glad to see included in the collection.

Commons before its destruction by fire, when the address in answer to the Royal Speech was moved at the first meeting of the reformed Parliament in 1833. To his description of this picture, Mr. Scharf has appended an alphabetical list of the Members represented in it, which, with the aid of a key plate, may enable the visitor to identify each of them.\* The 'Convention of the Anti-Slavery Society' represents the venerable Thomas Clarkson addressing the originators and leaders of that great movement, which ended in the liberation of England from the foul stain of slavery. Amongst those present at the meeting may be distinguished Samuel Gurney, Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Josiah Forster, Joseph Sturge, Lady Byron and Amelia Opie. The 'Meeting of the Royal Fine Arts Commission at Gwydyr House,' in 1846, contains twenty-eight portraits of men distinguished for their connection with literature and art, who had assembled under the presidency of Prince Albert to carry out his enlightened views for the encouragement of the fine arts in the United Kingdom. Of those who formed this Commission only one, as Mr. Scharf points out, is still living—the venerable Lord Eversley, then Speaker of the House of Commons.

Having thus described the contents of the National Portrait Gallery, it only remains for us, in conclusion, to refer to their arrangement, presuming that the day will come, however distant it may be, when a permanent and fitting building will be provided for their reception. The question will then be as to the best and most useful way of exhibiting the portraits. Are they to be arranged in chronological series, as they appear in the necrological list appended to the catalogue, or in classes according to the vocations of the originals, the order of date being still preserved? In adopting an arrangement by classes there will, no doubt, be some difficulty in dealing with a man who was eminent in more than one branch of human knowledge; but it is a difficulty which we conceive could be easily overcome, by selecting the one in which he was most distinguished. The question will also arise as to whether each class should be exhibited in an uninterrupted series, from the earliest to the latest date, or be divided according to the century in which the persons represented flourished? We believe that, all things considered, the most appropriate arrangement—the most instructive, and the one most easily understood by the great majority of the public—would be the classification

\* There is a picture at Clandon Park, the seat of the Earl of Onslow, representing the House of Commons in 1730, with Speaker Onslow in the Chair and Sir Robert Walpole speaking, which we should be glad to see in the National Portrait Gallery. It was painted by Sir James Thornhill in the same year.

according



according to vocations which we have indicated.\* A vast array of portraits, only hung according to date and unclassified, cannot but lead to confusion, and, notwithstanding the excellence of the catalogue, to some difficulty in finding any particular picture. An arrangement according to periods could not be strictly carried out, as the career of many men of eminence extended over parts of two centuries. The question of classification is, however, much simplified by the plan which Mr. Scharf, with excellent judgment and consideration for the public convenience, has adopted, of affixing to each portrait the descriptive label, which adds so much to the interest and utility of the collection as far as the visitors to the Gallery are concerned—a practice which we should be glad to see followed in all institutions of this nature.

We have, we trust, in the foregoing remarks, made our readers sensible of the great and growing importance of our National Portrait Gallery, and we feel convinced that they will think with us that the treatment which this noble collection has received from successive Governments has been little worthy of the nation.

---

\* This arrangement was advocated by the late Sir George C. Lewis. Mr. Scharf (in his notice of the National Portrait Gallery in the 'Companion to the Almanac for 1871') classifies the portraits under fourteen different heads—statesmen and diplomatists; literary characters, poets and historians; royalties; clergy of all denominations; scientific, including medical, engineers, travellers, philosophers and philanthropists; artists, including painters, sculptors and architects; military heroes; nobility; lawyers; naval heroes; ladies; actors and actresses; scholars; and musicians. But this division is too minute, and should be reduced to four, or at the most to five heads.

- ART. IV.—1. *Reports of the Committees of the House of Commons on National Provident Insurance. Sessions 1885, 1886, and 1887.*
2. *Report of the Hon. E. L. Stanley to the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies on his Inspection into the Affairs of the Royal Liver Friendly Society, with Letter of the Chief Registrar thereon, 1886.*
3. *Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, 1876 to 1887. Year Book of the Friendly Societies Registry Office, 1886.*
4. *The Friendly Society Movement: its Origin, Rise, and Growth; its Social, Moral and Educational Influences: the Affiliated Orders.* By the Rev. J. F. Wilkinson. London, 1886.

IT is just a hundred years since the necessity of wise legislation, to further the measures of self-help adopted by the industrial classes, began to be urged by Sir George Rose and others. In 1793 the first Friendly Societies Act was passed. Its avowed object was to protect and encourage societies of good fellowship, formed for the purposes of the mutual relief and maintenance of the members in sickness, old age, and infirmity, and the relief of the widows and children of deceased members, and effecting those purposes by means of the voluntary subscriptions of the members. Later Acts have enlarged this definition, but the keynote of all legislation in this country with regard to such societies is struck by that Act. It affirmed that this protection and encouragement would be likely to be attended with very beneficial effects, by promoting the happiness of individuals and at the same time diminishing the public burthens. This prediction has not been falsified, though it has been fashionable to assert, that Friendly Societies by failure have caused misery and pauperism, and to overlook the vast benefits they have conferred on their members.

The facts are that the hundred years have been years of continuous progress for Friendly Societies, and that they are now in a sounder and healthier condition than ever before. The members have gradually learned to know more exactly what they want and the right way to obtain it; and the kindly, old, pre-scientific notions of equal rates for everybody, the young paying for the old, and the like, have gradually given way to more accurate, and therefore more really equitable, methods of working. The influence of the general annual assemblies of the affiliated orders has been great in this direction. In every respect in which self-government has had free scope,  
its

its operation has been beneficial; and the little friendly clubs of a hundred years ago have developed into societies having large accumulated capitals, the fruit of the savings and the forethought of their members, exercised by way of provision for sickness and death.

This statement of the fact is not in accord with the prevailing impression on the public mind. Before and since the first Committee of investigation into the working of the Friendly Societies Acts sat in the year 1825, it has been matter of constant reiteration, that Friendly Societies as a whole are 'rotten' and 'unsound.' This impression is largely due, as we think, to a want of knowledge of the extent of the question, and of the variety of dissimilar bodies included under the general term 'Friendly Society.' It will be well, therefore, to clear the ground for the discussion of the subject by a statement of these several varieties. They were grouped by Her Majesty's Friendly Societies Commissioners in their Report of 1874 into as many as seventeen distinct classes, some of which again were divided into sub-classes, presenting marked differences in various respects from each other, in their organization and management.

It is not necessary, for the purposes of this article, to discuss at any great length the special characteristics of these numerous classes. Two or three of them, however, are worth examining in some detail. The first class named by the Commissioners is that of the affiliated Societies or Orders. Their history is very instructive. Though it covers nearly the whole of the hundred years over which our review extends, the time during which they have enjoyed the recognition of the law is little more than one-third of the hundred years. It was the policy of the earlier statutes to ignore them, and the Act of 1850 was the first which permitted them to register. The Act of 1855 qualified their branches also to register, but, by a strange oversight, did so in language, the legal construction of which rendered necessary their registry as separate societies, and not as branches. It appears from the useful little work of Mr. Wilkinson that these Orders originated in an imitation of the Freemasons, and adopted a ritual and nomenclature similar to theirs. Thus the Odd Fellows have their Lodges, the Foresters their Courts, the Shepherds their Sanctuaries, the Romans their Senates, the Sons of Temperance their Divisions, the Rechabites their Tents, and so forth, as designating in each case that which in the eye of the law is a branch. So for the designation of the chief officer, the Odd Fellows adopt the term Noble Grand or Grand Master; the Foresters, Chief Ranger; the Shepherds, Chief Shepherd; the Romans,

Romans, Most Excellent Consul; the Sons of Temperance, Grand Master; the Rechabites, Chief Ruler, and so on. Their ceremonies on initiation, their secrets, their lectures, their degrees, and other matters of ritual are also founded on those of the Orders of Masonry, and in their origin they were a similar harmless festive charity. Indeed, it may be said of all Friendly Societies that eccentricity of nomenclature is their strong point, as witness: 'Who'd have thought it Lodge,' 'Court Solomon's Greatly Wondering,' 'The Pursuers of Righteousness,' 'The Reviving Stag Lodge,' and a host of other strange titles which might be quoted as adopted by these societies.

The assemblies of these bodies are described by Mr. Wilkinson as 'social meetings having a moral tendency.' Their growth into organized benefit societies was slow and gradual. Their means of relief to members in sickness and distress were at first the casual donations of the members, afterwards converted into a fixed sum by way of periodical payment, and only long afterwards into a definite assurance earned by contributions nicely adjusted to the risks to be provided against. The like development may be observed in the history of Friendly Societies of all classes—from the old Guilds downwards. Members assemble in a brotherhood; one falls into distress, the others agree to relieve it by donations. In course of time it is observed that this method is precarious; that it would greatly save the self-respect of the distressed member if his relief were provided out of some fund raised by a fixed contribution made by all members alike instead of depending upon the casual impression which his needs and his merits have made upon each member individually; while the discovery, that distress is a result of a general law, and that it is practicable to apply the lessons of experience so as to suit the remedy to the risk, and apportion the contributions accordingly, is a long step in advance. In regard to the affiliated Orders, other steps remain to be taken. Their arrangements lead to a system of federation, which when fully developed may tend to a perfect type of Friendly Society. In the most highly-organized Orders there are three stages: the Lodge, by whatever name it may be called; the District, which is an aggregation of lodges; and the Order, which unites the whole. The usual arrangement was that the Lodges insured sick pay, the Districts death money, and the Order itself insured nothing. The Friendly Societies Act of 1875, however, in defining what constitutes a branch, introduced the double test—that a branch is a number of members of a society under the control of its central body, and contributing to a fund which that body administers; yet having a fund under its own control, administered by it or its committee.

The

The necessity of complying with this definition has made that universal which was before only partial among the Orders, viz. the raising a fund under the control of the central body by a contribution from every branch. Previously, many Orders had not cared to have any fund under the control of the central body other than that derived from the profit upon the sale to the lodges of the books, regalia, and other matters which the rules of the Order required that they should all be supplied with by the central authorities of the Order.

Several Orders have accordingly raised a fund for the relief of distressed lodges and districts; but as the relief granted from that fund is casual and discretionary with the central body, it does not amount to a complete federal guarantee of the engagements of the branches. A lodge remains still responsible for its own sick claims; and if a lodge becomes insolvent, the only relief its members can obtain is such as depends upon the discretion of the central body of the Order, exercised with reference to the past conduct of the lodge, and, indeed, to any other matters the central body may think material, and is not a claim of right on the part of the members. Whether any such claim of right could in safety be granted, is a question for the future to answer; if it should be answered in the affirmative, the affiliated system would then become a real federal union, and not, as most of the Orders now are, a mere gathering of bodies, each of them independent of the others.

Under the present system a lodge may be wholly insolvent, and a neighbour lodge possess a large surplus; but the members of the one have no claim on the other. So also a district may be unable to meet its claims; and as many districts raise their funds by the bad system of equal levies upon the lodges according to the number of their members, that is an event which is certain in the long run for each of such districts: while a neighbouring district, especially if it has raised its funds by the equitable method of graduated contributions, will have a large surplus; but the members of the one have not, and ought not in justice to have, any claim upon the other. It appears clear, therefore, that before any federal guarantee of the claims of members upon branches can be attempted, the Orders must prescribe the rates of contribution which the members of the branches shall pay, and also supervise their management.

The larger Orders have already forecast the future in these respects, and have resolved upon energetic measures to compel their lodges to adopt proper rates of contribution, and to husband their funds. In this they have had unexpected but valuable assistance from the High Court of Appeal, in the case of *Schofield*

*field v. Vaux*,\* where it was decided that a lodge having once declared itself a branch of an Order, and admitted members upon that footing, cannot secede from the Order except by compliance with such rules as the Order itself may make; and this, whether the branch is registered as such, or registered as a separate society, or indeed, as it would seem, if it is not registered at all.

Many of the smaller Orders have also made most praiseworthy exertions to improve the condition of their lodges. Most of them originated in secessions from the larger bodies of minorities who were discontented with measures resolved upon by the majority; but even these have learned wisdom by experience, and finally adopted for themselves the very measures they would not tolerate when imposed upon them by others. A notable case of this is the National Independent Order of Odd Fellows, which under the judicious guidance of its secretary, Mr. Cleveland, is rapidly rising to a much higher place among these organizations than it has hitherto possessed. Indeed, the working of the spirit of reform and progress is observable in nearly all the Orders.

It is curious to observe, how the decision in the above-mentioned case puts the finishing touch to the gradual process by which these Orders have advanced to full legal recognition. Looked upon at first as wholly illegal institutions, within the mischief against which the Corresponding Societies Acts were intended to provide; capable of being used, as was thought, for all sorts of evil political purposes; at enmity with religion and with social order: such were the senseless prejudices the Orders had for many years to meet and to live down. It was not till 1850 that they were admitted to registration at all; in 1875 the Legislature devised a means of giving full legal recognition to their contracts with their branches; and in 1886 the judicature upholds the contract in its full force. Thus one more instance is added to the many, which enforce the lesson Legislatures are often so slow to learn—that the test whether a contract ought to be legalized is whether it is one the people desire to enter into, not whether it is one the legislator thinks to be good for them. The province of the Legislature is to enforce the contracts men make, not to tell them what contracts they ought to make.

Even more instructive is the history of the progress of some of these great Orders towards perfection in their arrangements

\* This important case is not to be found in the authorized Reports, but a report has been printed from the shorthand notes by the central body of the Manchester Unity.

with their members. The Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows has been foremost in its efforts to secure financial soundness. Startled out of its security, many years ago, by the pamphlets of the late Mr. F. G. P. Neison, who showed that the society as a whole was in a deplorable financial condition, having funds less by many millions than it required to meet its liabilities, according to actuarial estimates, the society entered upon the wise course of closely observing and tabulating its own experience, under the able superintendence of its secretary, Mr. Henry Ratcliffe; of making periodical valuations of the assets and liabilities of every lodge; of enforcing upon all new members the payment of properly-graduated rates of contribution; of gradually bringing the contributions of the older members more nearly to the mark of safety; and of requiring from all new lodges the adoption of proper rules and rates. The result has been that every succeeding valuation has shown a marked improvement, and that the time is not far distant when this great Order in all its lodges will be financially sound, even from the actuarial point of view.

Another step in this direction has just been taken, viz. the enforcement upon the districts of properly graduated rates of contribution for their insurances of burial money. The Annual Movable Committee for 1887 has settled the question in the only right way, the districts giving up the haphazard and unfair system of levies.

The method by which these gradual improvements have been made, or are in progress, is that of an annual conference of delegates from each branch, held each year in a different town, and thus spreading all over the country the knowledge of sound principles. These conferences usually last several days, and are conducted with great decorum and good sense. In the larger Orders the annual conference is attended by several hundreds of individuals, the freely elected delegates of lodges and districts numbering hundreds of thousands of members. At these meetings amendments of the general rules of the Order are considered and resolved upon, many of which directly or indirectly affect the whole body of the members in all the branches. The discussion of these questions—particularly if they are such as involve an advanced knowledge of the requirements of actuarial science—will often extend over several successive years, and slowly and gradually gain ground.

In the existence of so useful an educational instrument as this annual conference, the affiliated Orders have a great advantage over the isolated societies. It is to them we look for further improvement. One which has not yet been perceived by



by the societies to be necessary, but which we are convinced lies at the root of all sound management, is that of granting a surrender value. When we consider for how long a time the Assurance Companies felt no compunction in confiscating other people's money, by the wholesale forfeiture of policies upon casual neglect to pay a premium, we need not be surprised to find that the moral sense of Friendly Societies is still equally undeveloped. As in the Assurance Companies of late years, the greater respect paid to the claims of justice has led to more careful and equitable management, so, we are persuaded, would it be the case with the Friendly Societies.

Such a reform as this would pave the way for the crowning achievement which lies before the Orders, viz. the real and complete federation of their branches; so that the Order should be able to guarantee the benefits promised by every branch. The attainment of this would so thoroughly mark the superiority of organized and centralized bodies such as the Orders over the isolated and individual society that the latter would before long disappear, and the Orders only hold the field. This seems to be already the case to a great extent in the colonies; in that of Victoria, Australia, there is not a single independent society registered, but only branches of Orders. For this to be desirable, however, it is necessary, first, that the Orders at large should follow the examples of the Manchester Unity and Ancient Order of Foresters in the reforms that they have already adopted, and then take the further steps which we have indicated.

One drawback to the general excellence of the affiliated system must, however, be noticed. It is its expense. Sir George Young, in his Report as Assistant Commissioner, points out that 'the threefold management of order, district, and lodge costs much more than that of a local club; not of course more by three times, but still more. The expense of sending delegates to the district and general meetings is often a severe tax. The percentage of expenditure in a well-managed lodge is higher than the average in large ordinary and local clubs, and about equal to that in country societies. It would be still higher, but that the secretaries are not, in general, paid the full market value of their services.' To this it may be added that the members often incur large voluntary extra expense in 'regalia' and other sources of outlay not included in the expenses of management from the funds.

The space which we have devoted to this particular class of Friendly Society is not too much for the interest it possesses as being entirely the creature of the members, and not of the

Legislature

Legislature or of the enlightened patron; as being the result of a process of natural development, and as having in it the promise of the future for Friendly Societies not only in this country, but in the colonies and the United States. We may now pass on to another group of societies, and point out the indebtedness of the industrial classes to many worthy and excellent men among the clergy and the wealthier orders of people for a wise initiative and for excellent management. No record of the history of Friendly Societies would have any pretence of completeness that did not place prominently forward this branch of the question, and show how much they owe to generous and enlightened patronage.

Among the pioneers in this course of kindly help was the Rev. J. T. Becher, Prebendary of Southwell. Early in the present century he framed a set of rules, and obtained the services of the best actuaries of that day for the construction of tables of rates, as models for use by societies; and the result was the constitution of several bodies under the name of Becher Clubs. Towards the expenses of management, subscriptions were obtained from honorary members, and it was one of the principles of the scheme that honorary members should have a place on the committee, and therefore a share in the control of the club. It was also provided that there should be a periodical valuation of the assets and liabilities, that the accounts should be rendered to the members in very full detail, and that a member desiring to leave should receive the full value of his assurance benefits.

Another clergyman to whom Friendly Societies owe much is the late Hon. Samuel Best, who originated what is called the Deposit system. This is a combination of the Friendly Society and Savings Bank. A minimum contribution is required from every member, and the balance is retained for his benefit. If he falls sick, a portion of the sick pay is provided out of the contribution he has made to the general fund, the remainder being taken from his own private fund. When the latter is exhausted, the allowance ceases. The plan is excellently devised to meet the objection often raised by the unthinking to the system of an ordinary Friendly Society, that the member who escapes sickness gets nothing for his money. Under the deposit system, the fund belonging to the members who do not claim sick pay will in time reach a handsome sum, and form an abundant provision for old age; but, on the other hand, if a member suffers from prolonged sickness, he finds that his private fund has become exhausted, and the allowance from the common fund dies with it. This is, of course, no more than an application of the

the common proverb, 'that you cannot eat your cake and have it too'; but it compares unfavourably with the system of the ordinary Friendly Society, which guarantees sick pay out of the contributions of the other members. Hence, though several deposit societies have been formed, they have not attracted large bodies of members, or become really popular. Mr. Best's personal influence did much to promote their success during his life, but it has not been maintained to any extent worth mentioning.

The name of the late Right Hon. W. E. Forster is another that should be remembered with respect, whenever the history of Friendly Societies is attempted to be traced, however superficially. He was struck with that cardinal difficulty of the question, how best to provide for old age. The ordinary Friendly Society cannot extract from its members a contribution larger than that required for relief during such sickness as occurs to a member while he is of the working age; whenever it holds out the promise of relief during old age, it does so only to disappoint the members at their time of greatest need; and this promise, and the consequent disappointment, have served as the text of those who condemn Friendly Societies. Mr. Forster, with the view of gaining the best information as to the means of meeting this difficulty, offered three prizes for the best essays on the question, and obtained from authors connected with existing affiliated and other societies a number of suggestions, which have been adopted in the formation of several societies, and may tend to help the members in old age.

In this honourable roll of men of culture and experience, who have aided the members of friendly societies with sympathy, counsel, and active assistance, the name of Mr. John Tidd Pratt should not be omitted. When the Act of 1827 for regulating Savings Banks was passed, he was appointed under it to be the barrister for certifying rules, and the final referee in disputes. In the next year (1828) the law relating to Friendly Societies was consolidated, with many amendments. It was found that the provisions of the earlier statutes, by which the rules of an intended Friendly Society were to be submitted to the justices in Quarter Sessions for their allowance and confirmation, and a certificate produced to such justices from two professional actuaries or persons skilled in calculation, that the rates of contribution proposed to be charged would be sufficient, had altogether failed in their intended object. While some justices took a strict view of the requirements of the law and rejected certificates from unqualified persons, others accepted any certificate that was tendered, and the lax ones were the majority. The

village schoolmaster was the favourite; and his certificate, as a 'person skilled in calculation,' as indeed he was, started many societies on their career. Probably it was as valuable as, at that time of day, any certificate would have been, for then, and for many years thereafter, the skilled actuary had no data of any real value to go upon, and actuaries of high reputation certified tables for societies which subsequent experience showed to be wholly insufficient for safety. It was clear that the justices and the skilled persons had broken down: and the Legislature wisely resolved, that henceforth it would look after the text of the contract between members of societies from a legal point of view, and leave the terms of it to mutual agreement. Accordingly, all provisions for making societies safe by Act of Parliament were abandoned, and it was provided that societies should submit their proposed rules to a barrister, to see that they were so framed as to carry out the intentions of the members. To the Savings Bank barrister appointed in the previous year this new duty was confided; and thus originated the connection of Mr. Tidd Pratt with Friendly Societies, which lasted more than forty years. Had he been disposed to take a merely perfunctory view of his duties, he might have made them very easy, but he was a man of great force of character, and he felt it incumbent upon him to go beyond the narrow limits of his official functions, and to assist with all the powers of a very original mind every person who came across him with a scheme for the improvement or development of Friendly Societies. The present occupant of the office of Chief Registrar, Mr. John Malcolm Ludlow, C.B., for whose appointment the public are indebted to the wise judgment of the late Earl of Iddesleigh, is also a man who has made his name honoured by many years of self-denying exertion for the good of the working classes, and has well earned the confidence they repose in him. The excellent Year Book, which he has prepared, expounds, in the minutest detail, the relations of the societies to the office over which he presides, and cannot fail to be of great use to the members of societies. It is a masterpiece of clear exposition, and no officer or member who has it can justly excuse himself for the neglect of any duty or the loss of any right.

Among the societies which owe their success to the efforts of such men as we have named, are the large county societies established in many parts of the kingdom, and also numerous town and village societies. These have in most cases met with all the prosperity, which the excellent intentions of the founders merited, but not with the popularity that should have been the consequence of it. Those for whose benefit they were intended have

have never joined them in the large numbers that might have been expected. The reason of this has been partly the high rates of contribution necessarily demanded by a society, where a condition of its existence is actuarial soundness as compared with those demanded by many village clubs; the uninstructed tendency of the workman to join a club, in which the payments he has to make are more suitable to his means, even though the benefits it promises to him are not so secure, trusting that it may last his time, or that in the chapter of accidents it may be able to meet its claims somehow; and partly, a preference for societies, which he is able to manage badly for himself, over others which are managed well for him by other people. It is not to be overlooked, moreover, that the convivial and social elements in the man are more fully gratified in the small village club than in the patronized county society. The question has been revived of late years, whether societies should be allowed to be formed at all, which do not give some guarantee of the soundness of the calculations upon which their proceedings are based; and Lord Greville has introduced into two successive parliaments a Bill to prevent the establishment of any society without an actuary's certificate to its tables of rates. By the existing law a society cannot be registered, which insures to its members a certain annuity or a certain superannuation, without a certificate from a qualified actuary to the tables of contribution for such insurance; and Lord Greville would extend that provision to the tables of contribution for all benefits, such as sick pay, and the assurance of a sum at death, and would extend it, moreover, so as to prohibit the formation of any society without such a certificate. In former years, as we have seen, Acts have been passed prohibiting the registry of societies without some form of guarantee that their tables are sound. In the Act of 1819 provision was made, that no tables or rules connected with calculation were to be confirmed by the justices, until they had been approved by two persons at least, known to be professional actuaries or persons skilled in calculation, as fit and proper, according to the most correct calculation of which the case admitted.

It has never before, however, been contemplated, that the establishing a society without a certificate of an actuary should be an offence. One cannot help thinking that the proposers of this Draconic legislation have never formed in their own minds an idea of what it implies. No little group of men in a country village are to agree, that they will share the risks of life together on terms that seem to them fair and equal, unless they can induce some actuary to say that the terms are so. No

contract having regard to the relief of possible future distress is to be entered into, unless it squares with the rules that some actuary may lay down. The people who choose to do what they will with their own and defy the actuaries are to be treated as criminals. A slate club is started; no actuary will certify it; so, send the members to prison.

We do not wish to be understood as disparaging the scientific efforts of actuaries to ascertain the real value of the risks, which members of Friendly Societies desire to assure against, or as throwing any doubt upon the results which they have obtained, or upon the probable importance of the great series of observations—extending, we are informed, over more than ten millions of facts—which the actuary to the Central Office for the Registry of Friendly Societies has been long engaged in preparing from the quinquennial returns for the quarter of a century from 1855 to 1880. Scientific accuracy is of the highest possible importance, but in this question it is not everything. In a matter which depends so largely upon the means of the members to meet their wants, and upon the power they have to adjust the one to the other, there is more to be thought of than mere actuarial science.

Many societies have existed for long series of years, and have done much good to their members, whose tables would never have been certified by an actuary; many, indeed, have never had any tables at all. By the kindly forbearance of members who have been fortunate enough to be beyond the necessity of claiming the benefits they have assured for, by the cultivation of a sense of good fellowship, and by the formation of a sort of *esprit de corps* which forbids malingering and safeguards the funds of the society, many such societies have been prosperous and useful for generation after generation. It should be made matter of careful and anxious reflection by those who seek to level all societies up to actuarial soundness, whether they may not by such means lose other elements of soundness and usefulness still more worth the keeping.

The case of the dividing societies is one quite in point. Since the Act of 1875 provided, that a rule for, or practice of, dividing any part of the funds of a society should not disentitle it to registry, if the rules contained distinct provision for meeting all claims upon the society existing at the time of division before the division takes place, the great majority of the new Friendly Societies formed have been of this class. Before the passing of that Act such societies were equally popular, but they either remained unregistered or omitted from their rules all mention of the practice of division. The reason of the popularity

larity of these societies is not far to seek ; having no desire to make provision for old age, but merely for those accidental sicknesses and calamities which affect men in full work, the members see no necessity for accumulating a large fund, and prefer themselves to enjoy the fruits of their savings. They are willing, moreover, to pay a larger contribution than a man will easily be induced to pay to a permanent society, because the overplus comes back to them at the end of the year. The arrangement is well understood by the members, who get out of it all the advantages they seek, and there is no principle of sound policy upon which legal sanction should be refused to it, merely because it has not other advantages which they do not seek.

The same observation applies to the proposal that it should be compulsory on every society to become registered. Translated into plain English this means, that every little knot of men, who care to combine together for any provident purpose, to put their own money together for any purpose of mutual relief, shall be held guilty of an offence for which they are to be punishable by imprisonment, if they do not put themselves in a certain relation with a department of the State. This is a grave departure from the sound principles of our old Common Law, which left men free to act for themselves in many matters which modern theories of State Socialism propose to hand over to the Government. The existing law itself goes further than there is need in this direction, for the decision of the High Court in the case of the *Padstow Total Loss Association* \* shows, that a mutual benefit society may in certain circumstances be deemed to be a society for purposes of profit, and if so, it becomes an illegal society, if unregistered as soon as it consists of twenty members ; but the mere illegality of the society would not satisfy the wishes of some of our law reformers, who would make its very existence a criminal offence by each of its members.

We need not pursue, in further detail, the other varieties of the ordinary Friendly Societies for insuring relief in sickness and payments at death, which were enumerated by the Commissioners. One class, however, is distinguished in every possible way from all others, and should always be thought of as distinct : it would be well, indeed, if it were provided for by a separate Act of Parliament, and this we understand is proposed to be done by a Bill of which Sir John Lubbock has charge. The class referred to is that of the great collecting burial societies, the type of which in its highest development is the Royal Liver

---

\* 20 Ch. Div. 137.



Society. This Society carries on its operations throughout the United Kingdom, and has upwards of 1,100,000 members. The nature of the interest of these members in the Society is widely different, however, from that of the member of an ordinary Friendly Society. He is insured not for sick pay, but only for a small sum as burial money. He attends no meeting to pay his contribution, but waits till a collector calls for it. Among the members are included infants of all ages. The members, as such, have as yet had no real voice in the management.

With these societies are correlated others not registered under the Friendly Societies Acts, but doing the same business in the same way as the collecting burial societies. The most important of these industrial assurance companies is the Prudential, which has even a larger business than the Royal Liver Society, and, being a proprietary company, does not affect to give the persons insured even an illusory share in the management. The small weekly contributions of a few pence from each policy-holder afford in the aggregate an enormous margin of profit for the benefit of the proprietors. On the other hand, the expenses of management are enormous. This is to a great extent unavoidable, for the services of collectors must of course be paid for. These companies, however, not being under the Friendly Societies Acts, withdraw themselves from the criticism which the registered Collecting Societies are exposed to, though there is reason to fear, that their manner of doing business is little, if any, better.

The admirable provision of the Friendly Societies Acts, enabling a small number of the members of a registered Friendly Society to apply to the Chief Registrar for an inspection into its affairs, has recently thrown a flood of light upon the manner in which the Royal Liver Society has hitherto carried on its business. We have no reason to suppose, that this Society is any worse than others of its class, but every ground for belief that on the whole it is the best of them. If that be so, we may well wonder what further disclosures, than those made in Mr. Lyulph Stanley's Report, would result from an inspection into some of those others: the more so that his inspection was itself cut short by a series of very curious incidents.

So much of the story of the Society, as Mr. Stanley was able to elicit, is very instructive. It rejoiced in the possession of two managing secretaries, of whom it may not unfairly be said that their qualifications to be managers, in the sense of knowing how to get their own way, were vastly greater than any literary qualifications they possessed for the office of secretary. In 1875, which date was adopted by Mr. Stanley as the starting-point

point for his inquiry, these officials had the not ungenerous salary of 20*l.* a week, or 1040*l.* a year each. At the annual meeting of the Society held in that year, it was resolved that, in addition to their salaries, they should have a commission of 2½ per cent. each on all new business. In 1881, their salaries were raised to 40*l.* a week each, in addition to the commission, which by this time brought them in a further sum of 2277*l.* each per annum. By the time the application to the Chief Registrar was made, their income amounted to 5980*l.* each per annum. Before the inquiry took place, they resolved to bow to the storm, forego their commissions, and accept fixed salaries of 3000*l.* each. When it closed, they resigned at once their offices and the emoluments they derived from them, upon the simple stipulation that by-gones should be by-gones, and that no officer of the Society should suffer for the side taken.

This very summary statement of the relations of the secretaries to the Society suffices to show, that it was really managed in the interest of the officers, rather than in that of the members. Mr. Stanley's report, however, fills out the outline with many incidents of interest. The managing secretaries governed the Society with all due constitutional form. They had a Committee of Management: that Committee had its share of the spoil. The salary of each member was 884*l.* a year. But, says Mr. Stanley, 'during the whole of the ten years over which my inspection has extended, the two secretaries have been everything, the committee nothing. The very lithographed forms that go out from the office, state on the face of the resolutions of the Committee, Resolved *unanimously*. For many of the most important decisions of the office there is no minute whatever; large payments have habitually been made on the order, often verbal, of the secretaries, or of either of them.' The committee met daily, but their main function seems to have been drawing their salary. 'The way in which the accounts and records of the Society are kept makes it practically impossible for a member, if he claimed his right under the Act of Parliament, of examining the books of the Society, to find out anything material from them.'

Mr. Stanley further reported, that the exorbitant remuneration of the secretaries led to other mischief. Being calculated by way of commission, it gave them 'a strong motive for increasing the mass of the business, so as to swell the gross receipts, regardless of the fact, that they were greatly increasing the cost of management.' Before 1875 the cost of management had been less than 40 per cent.; in 1877 it was increased to over 47 per cent., or in other words, out of every shilling collected from the members

members about 5½d. went in management. The mischief was growing. 'Not only was the money of the Society spent on canvassers and travelling agents, but also an aggressive policy was set on foot. This policy led to underhand dealings with the collectors and agents of other societies, to litigation, often unavowed and secret, to bribery of newspapers, and the circulation of libels through hired writers who posed before the public as independent authors.'\*

Among the consequences that would naturally follow, as they did follow, from this method of doing business, was a complete disregard of the Society's rules. The collectors were permitted to levy charges upon the members, beyond those authorized by the rules, to the extent of 2000*l.* a year. The minute-book was kept in a slovenly manner. 'Many important documents were not forthcoming, and no record was kept of the most important letters of the office.' 'It is obvious that in a society, like the Royal Liver, there are only two parties who have any real power, the head office and the collectors. The members are scattered throughout the country. They have no cohesion, no power of knowing each other, and too small an interest to take the trouble to master the facts and vote. A general meeting called in Liverpool, with perhaps 1500 persons present, of whom 600 or 700 will be officials, and their families and friends, is an absurd mode of governing a society with 1,100,000 members, 360,000*l.* a year of premium income, and more than 800,000*l.* of invested capital.'† No one can doubt the justice of this remark of Mr. Stanley.

We need hardly follow him into the details of the war carried on by the secretaries with rival societies, or the strange expedients they used to gain the business of societies which had failed, or the curious history of their relations with their eminent consulting actuary. Those who have the free use of large sums of money can obtain the services of highly-placed professional men as auditors or actuaries, or valuers of property, and the secretaries of the Royal Liver Society fully appreciated their advantages in this respect, and did not hesitate to use them.

Professional men of high position were not, however, the only instruments used by the managers of this Society for their own purposes. When the business in hand was the controlling the proceedings of a general meeting, they used instruments of a very different kind. In 1880, a Mr. Harper, who had previously been an ally of the secretaries, was dissatisfied with

---

\* Stanley, p. 7.

† Ibid. p. 9.

the nature of the Society's investments, and gave notice of motion to call attention to them. 'His evidence is distinct that Mr. Liversage,' one of the secretaries, 'when Mr. Harper said at the meeting he would go on with his motion, said, "Look round." He saw a lot of roughs. One of them, whom he knew, told him they were there to break a fellow's head who was going to move a resolution. He says further, that Frederick Atherton,' brother to the other secretary, 'was at the head of those roughs.'\*

It is hardly necessary to pursue any further this sordid story. Under the name of a grand provident institution for assisting the very poor to provide for that which is to their sentiments a matter of the most urgent necessity, viz. a decent funeral when they depart this life, we find a concern worked for the personal benefit of two or three men and their immediate satellites, every possible device resorted to to maintain their power, and the money, that might be made available for increasing the benefits of the members, wasted recklessly in the personal interest of the managers. To the men themselves, the prize was so rich, that it is hardly to be wondered at that they should grow unscrupulous as to the means by which they would seek to retain its possession. To those outside, who had some inkling of what it was worth, it was equally attractive, and invited attack.

The result of Mr. Stanley's inspection was the resignation of the two managing secretaries of the Society, and the appointment in their place of the chief mover in the agitation for reform. The expenses were thus considerably reduced, and the rules of the Society have since been altered so as to provide for something in the nature of representative government; but it may well be doubted, whether much has in fact been done to remedy the evils which seem to be inherent in this class of society.

Is it right or even expedient that the insurances of the poorer classes should be left in the hands of societies like these? The question is difficult to answer. It is better that they should insure their lives, even upon such costly terms as are required to meet the expense of such management as this, than that they should not be insured at all. Can means be devised for granting them the benefits of insurance on easier terms? Yes: if they will only seek the insurance themselves; but that is exactly what they will not do. They have to be canvassed and coaxed to effect the insurance; to be constantly visited, or they will

---

\* Stanley, p. 10.

not keep it up : they cannot be relied upon for any spontaneous action in the matter. If they would only go to a Government office, such as the Life Assurance Department of the Post Office, they would get better served on cheaper terms ; but they will not go, and it is difficult to see how the department can go to them.

It has been suggested, for instance, that the letter carriers of the Post Office should be employed as collectors of the penny subscriptions of the poor for the purpose of life assurance ; but a hundred difficulties arise as soon as the proposition is put in practical form. The letter carrier would have to make a special visit, for the class, which the Burial Society collector deals with, is not one that has a large correspondence to receive. He would have to receive a considerable sum of money, in respect of which a system of checks would have to be devised that would be exceedingly difficult to maintain. He would have to create in his own mind a special enthusiasm for the work, which the moderate pay he gets as a letter carrier is hardly enough to engender. In other words, he would have to be paid by a commission on his receipts, and the Government department, to which he is attached, would have a great deal of difficulty in adjusting a number of delicate questions that would arise under this head. He would have to be instructed to use all the arts of persuasion which the Burial Society canvasser and collector is trained to practise, or he would not succeed in inducing the poor to insure, or to keep up their insurances. Is there any chance that the inferior officers of a government department could be drilled into the exercise of functions so far apart from the ordinary course of their duties, or, with the utmost desire to do all that could be expected of them, would succeed as well as the ordinary canvasser ?

The conclusion seems to be that, if the persons for whom these small insurances are desirable could be educated to the point of seeking them for themselves without the intervention of a canvasser, and keeping them up without that of a collector, these large burial societies and Industrial Assurance Companies could well be dispensed with ; and a government office could provide the insurances better and more cheaply than they do ; but while the poorer classes remain so unwilling as they are to take trouble for a future benefit, and so ready to drop a policy rather than put themselves to any inconvenience about it, the canvasser and the collector will continue to be necessary evils, and all that can be done will be to introduce into the legislation respecting such societies any provision that may tend to increase the power of the members, and limit that of the managers.

This

This was the meaning of the several provisions of s. 30 of the Friendly Societies Act of 1875, which debarred collectors from becoming members of the Committee of Management of such a society, and prohibited their voting and acting at its meetings. Mr. Stanley obtained evidence to show, that these provisions of the Act are largely evaded, and it may not be impossible to devise some means of better enforcing them.

It is to be borne in mind all through the consideration of this matter, that the persons insured in such societies belong to a lower stratum of the population than the respectable artisan who forms the bulk of the members of the ordinary Friendly Society. It is also not to be overlooked, that illegal practices prevail among them: in particular that of the insurance of the lives of others. In any society under the Friendly Societies Acts, whether of the collecting Burial Society class or any other, it is illegal for a member to insure the life of another person, beyond making a provision for the necessary funeral expenses of the wife or child of the member himself; yet it is not unusual in these societies for members to insure the lives of more distant relatives, or even of persons to whom they are not related at all. It is obvious that, apart from its illegality, a practice like this is a real danger to life. The effect of it, however, in a legal point of view, does not seem to go beyond the invalidating of the policy under the Gambling Act of last century; and it may be well worth the consideration of the Legislature to devise some specific penalty for conduct which is thus not only illegal but dangerous. Cases have occurred in the criminal courts in which the existence of policies of this kind has been an incentive to murder.

Another risk in the same direction is that arising from the insurance of the lives of children. A large proportion of the nominal 'members' of these Societies are infants, who are admitted in some societies from birth. These may be lawfully insured by their parents for a sum not exceeding 6*l*. It is to be hoped that this sum is not large enough to tempt a parent to murder; but it is certainly dangerous to give the parent even the smallest monetary interest in the loss of an infant's life. It would, at any rate, have been better if the amendment introduced into the House of Lords, reducing the amount to 3*l*., had been adopted. It was, however, objected to by the House of Commons, and not insisted upon by their Lordships. Three pounds would, in most cases, be enough to cover the really necessary expenses of the burial of a young child, and whatever goes beyond that is dangerous. It is fair to state that there has never been any direct evidence of child murder for burial money existing

existing as a system. A few flagrant instances have been discovered; but it is for the honour of human nature to hold that they are exceptional. The real danger is not so much that of actual murder, as the tendency to look upon the death of the child as a source of profit, and thus to neglect the means of keeping it in healthy life. Many of the deaths of children among the poor arise from this cause, and the existence of a money interest in the death is likely to increase rather than diminish the tendency to neglect. We think it not improbable, moreover, that the excellent provision of the Act which forbids the payment of a sum of money on the death of a child under ten years of age to any person other than its parent, or the personal representative of the parent if deceased, is too often transgressed or evaded. Even upon this point, however, it must be admitted, that the Chief Registrar has not been able to obtain such evidence of malpractice as would justify prosecution in a single case in the ten years which he reviews in the Reports before us. The general conclusion upon this important head is, that the evils arising from child insurance are less than might have been feared, but yet sufficiently real to justify and render necessary the maintenance and the strengthening of these precautions which the Legislature has devised to obviate them. The anomaly of infant membership has ceased in respect of societies established since 1875, as they are prohibited (except in the case of certain societies having members wholly between three and sixteen) from having members younger than sixteen years of age.

The broad distinction to be drawn between the large collecting society, and the Friendly Society of every other class, is simply this:—the one is managed by the members for their own benefit, the other exists for the benefit of those who manage it. In the latter case, though the contributions may be ample for actuarial safety, and may indeed be excessive, the tendency will always be to increase more and more the demands upon them for the cost of management; and thus the unfortunate members may not only pay during a long series of years a sum greatly more than necessary to secure the insurance they desire, but may find that even that is not secured for them, for their partners in the unequal bargain have robbed them even of the share which was their right under the contract. The cases of the 'Independent Mutual Brethren Society' and the 'United Assurance Society' are illustrations of this, as are also those of the 'Swansea Royal,' 'Integrity,' and 'British Workman's' Societies. The story of the first-named, as told by the Chief Registrar in his Reports, and with more detail by Mr. Sutton, is curious. Originally started as an ordinary small local



local Society, it fell into the hands of people who saw their way to convert it into a Society for their own benefit, rather than that of the members, and devised an ingenious system of lodges all over the country, which, not being registered as branches, gave their members no real share in the management of the concern, but looked so much like genuine branches of a self-governing unity as to induce members to join under the impression that they were so. From the very first, these people expended in the management of the Society, especially in the establishment of these lodges, sums far in excess of their fund for management.

Year after year, the officers of the Society were prosecuted by the Registrar for not making the required returns or valuations, as the case might be, and were content to pay the penalty, knowing that nothing more could be done to them. This did not prevent their establishing fresh 'lodges,' getting more members, and spending all the money, which the members were unwise enough to entrust them with. A course of management such as this must come to an end in time; and at last the efforts of a few clergymen and others to make known the real character of the Society, at the risk of actions for libel and heavy costs, had some success, and the influx of new members ceased. Funds were not forthcoming to meet claims; judgments were obtained against the Society in many local courts in various parts of the country, only to find that nothing was left to satisfy them.

The 'United Assurance Society,' originally called the United Assurance Society of St. Patrick, had been established more than fifty years, and when it closed its doors had nothing left out of the contributions of members, some of whom had subscribed to it for nearly the whole time of its existence, and all of whom belonged to a class of hard-working poor, who could ill afford to lose their money. It had a large branch in Ireland, and extended its operations wherever the poor labouring class congregated. So little of cohesion was there between the members, that after the closing of its doors it was found impracticable to get 500 signatures, necessary for an application to the Chief Registrar to exercise the power given to him under the sections of the Act, which permit compulsory dissolution on the ground of insolvency, and enable an investigation to be made into the causes which led to the disaster.

The same sad story is to be told of the other societies named—wanton extravagance, injudicious and even fraudulent investment of funds, and a continuance of business, including the admission of new members, long after the insolvency of the Society had become manifest. In one case only was a criminal prosecution

prosecution instituted against the responsible managers, and that resulted in a conviction. In that instance, the assets had dwindled down, till they consisted of nothing but a printing-press, which itself the Society had no right to invest its funds in. In another case, the managers had ingeniously started a Building Society, to which they lent the funds of the Friendly Society, without disclosing the names of those to whom the Building Society advanced them. This Society succeeded in inducing an Industrial Assurance Society to undertake its liabilities, and to accept a transfer of the remnant of its assets as a consideration.

It must not be supposed that the evils inherent in this class of society have sprung up all at once. Long before the Report of the Commissioners in 1874, Mr. Tidd Pratt had for years called attention to the unsatisfactory management of the collecting Burial Societies, and had shown in his annual reports, that they were every year expending in management as much as or more than they gave in benefits to their members, and that their accumulated assets were ridiculously small as compared with the liabilities they had incurred. Ten years after he had commenced agitating the question, the legislation of 1875 provided special checks upon this class of Society, and the experience of the ten years which have since passed seems to show that these checks are insufficient. What further measures ought to be adopted?

If the State cannot enter into effectual competition with these societies, as we have seen it is hardly likely to be able to do, it is evident that their regulation and not their extinction is what should be aimed at; for as long as they attract members who will not insure through any other medium, they fulfil a useful purpose, and the millions, to whom they have rendered assistance in time of need, far outnumber the thousands to whom their failure has caused disappointment and loss. If they can be prevented from increasing the number of the latter, they may well be left to add to the former class as many as they can. It is better that a poor man should be insured for a small sum at an unduly high rate of premium, than that he should not be insured at all. How are we to secure that he shall not be disappointed?

Something might be done by giving the proper authority power to wind up compulsorily a society of this class, when a valuation showed that its assets were insufficient to meet its liabilities. When that is the case, it is evident that the society has been ill-managed, for the contributions of members to these societies are always more than sufficient to meet the calculated risk.

risk. They, in fact, ask the members for much more than is really necessary to effect the insurances. Hence the appearance of an estimated deficiency in a valuation is proof positive against them. The authority, to whom power would be given to act in such a case, should be entitled to make such arrangement as he thought fit for the benefit of the members, by obtaining for them a reduced insurance under the guarantee of some solvent society, or in default to distribute among them the assets of the society while it had any.

Power might also be given to the proper authority to interfere in cases where, from the annual return or otherwise, it appeared, that the society's funds were being improperly invested or wasted in unnecessary expenses of management. In a case of this kind, it would not be unreasonable for the State to appoint a receiver of the society's funds, and thus ensure that no expenditure other than that legally necessary for carrying on its business should thenceforth be incurred, and that no investment other than those contemplated by the Act and suitable for such a society should thenceforth be made. If it be thought too strong a measure to allow the Chief Registrar to take a step of this kind on his own motion, it might at least be provided that it should be competent for him to do so, when applied to by a certain number of the members of such a society.

Though the societies of this class present so unfavourable a view, and are to be looked at quite apart from the ordinary Friendly Benefit Society, they form no exception to the general statement we have ventured to make, as to the progress of Friendly Societies during the last hundred years. The legislation of 1875 has served only to bring to light, and to assist in providing a remedy for evils which existed to a much greater extent before its passing, as the Reports of the Royal Commissioners and their assistants abundantly show. Previously the ruffianism, the extravagance, the dishonesty reigned unchecked; the machinery of inspection, the checks which the Act provides on the power of the collector, and the full publicity enforced as to the real facts of the society's position by the annual return, and the quinquennial valuation, have made the condition of these societies very different from what it was before 1875.

Reverting from these societies to the ordinary type of Friendly Society, it may have been observed that we have laid little stress upon a matter, which is one of the distinctive features of the Act of 1875, and which is undoubtedly of great importance, viz. the requirement once in every five years from every society of an actuarial valuation of its assets and liabilities. We are of opinion that, great as the usefulness of these valuations may here-  
after

after become, the time has not come when a general conclusion can safely be founded upon them, that it is not from a single valuation, but from a comparison of the results of successive valuations, that inferences should be drawn as to the real condition of societies: that many elements in their solvency are necessarily omitted from the considerations of the valuer, and that only by a very slow process can trustworthy results be developed from his work.

If the requirement of compulsory valuation had been part of the law thirty years ago, as it is very much to be wished it had been, we should now be in possession of materials for forming a just judgment of the actual position of the bulk of the societies; and it would doubtless have been in every respect much better than it is. The knowledge of the actuarial conditions of soundness in Friendly Societies is a very important element in their management; and if that knowledge had been generally imparted to them a quarter of a century earlier than it has been, they would have had time to correct many of the mistakes they have innocently made, and would have distributed the relief they offer more equitably among the members standing in need of it. Now that this powerful instrument has been furnished to them their progress in this direction will, doubtless, be rapid.

We have said, and as far as limits of space have allowed, have shown, that the hundred years, during which Friendly Societies have been organized in England, have been years of uninterrupted progress towards better things in respect of their safety and their usefulness. We look forward towards the next hundred years with confidence that this progress will continue, and that year by year Friendly Societies will become safer and more useful. There are many, however, who are not content with the slow and gradual process of improvement from within, and are anxious to devise means by which the thrift of the working classes may be stimulated from without. Committees of the House of Commons have been sitting during the sessions of 1885, 1886, and 1887, 'to inquire into the best system of National Provident Insurance against Pauperism.' It is not surprising that the Committees should have been unable to agree upon any recommendation which would combine all the conditions implied in this reference. The system to be devised is to be the best; it is to be national; it is not to infringe the great principles of providence; it is to be an insurance; and not only so, it is to be a prophylactic against pauperism. The first witness before the Committee of 1885, the last witness before that of 1886, and the principal witness before that of 1887, were the same,

same, namely, Canon Blackley, who in the first instance defined a scheme which appears to him to satisfy these conditions, and in the second and third replied upon the objections that had been raised to his plan by others. The Committee of 1887 has finally reported against it.

The scheme has much in it that is taking at first sight. It seeks to meet the pauperism which arises from sickness or old age by the insurance of a small weekly sum; to enforce the payment of the necessary premium at a very early period of life; and it proposes to require this payment from every individual, rich and poor, male and female. It does not provide any sum at death; and its author seems to contemplate that, though every person is to contribute the premium, no one is to claim the benefit of the insurance, unless he is in such a condition of need that he would otherwise be compelled to become a pauper. It is here that we think the weakness of the proposed system mainly appears. Pauperism is a great evil; and any method that could be devised to diminish it, to any material extent, must be a great blessing; but pauperism may exist without residence in the workhouse, or the receipt of outdoor relief.

Obviously, therefore, the first thing to be done, in devising a plan by which the State can insure against pauperism, is to define exactly what is the pauperism that is to be insured against. Canon Blackley states his proposal in the following terms:—

‘I propose that every individual in the nation shall be liable, by law, after reaching the age of 18 years, to contribute, either in one sum or by instalments, 10*l.* or thereabouts to a National Sick and Pension Benefit Society, which would secure to him or her, when prevented by sickness from earning his or her usual wages, a sum of 8*s.* a week until 70 years of age, and after 70 years of age a cessation of the sick pay, but a pension for life of 4*s.* a week.’

If the premium were adequate, and the sick pay and pension were duly paid to every person who had paid the premium, the difficulty of defining what is pauperism for the purpose of such an insurance would not arise, for every purchaser, that is in the case supposed every individual of the population, would receive the insurance, whether he would otherwise have become a pauper or not; but the premium is not adequate for that purpose, and it is not intended that all who pay it shall have the benefit of it. Mr. Blackley seeks to distinguish between those who are wage-earners and those who are not, and to give the benefits of his scheme to the former class only. The result of course is that, for all persons who are not wage-earners, the payment of 10*l.* is a tax and not an insurance; or if the possible

contingency of a person now not a wage-earner becoming one before he is seventy years of age be taken into account, it is the insurance of a remote and trifling risk at a very high premium.

Canon Blackley, indeed, urges that :—

‘If we go to our workhouses we find that there are plenty of people there who were once rich—men who have kept their packs of hounds. We want that every one shall give security to the nation against requiring relief from pauperism, and that he shall give that which will secure him against claiming the poor rate. No man, however well provided he is at present, can say that you can give a cheaper security than would be afforded by the 10*l.* that he will never become a pauper.’

In this he seems to depart from his definition of wage-earner ; but however that may be, he omits to notice that 10*l.* would be an unduly high premium to charge where the risk of becoming a pauper is small, in other words, that he is insuring an unequal risk by equal premiums.

The confusion between an insurance and a tax, which lies at the foundation of the plan, is observable in many of its details. An insurance of two distinct benefits should be granted only in consideration of separate premiums. The manner in which the premium for sick pay ought to be calculated is very different from the manner in which the premium for a deferred annuity ought to be calculated. Accordingly, the premium for the one ought to be kept separate from that for the other. In a sick pay assurance, it is to be expected that there will be fluctuations from year to year, and that the experience of a very sickly year will be compensated for by the favourable experience of healthy years to follow. In a deferred annuity, there is no such compensation to be looked for. The body which contracts to pay a deferred annuity must see that it receives the exact premium which is the calculated equivalent of the annuity, and that such premium is invested and the interest reinvested the moment it is received until the day when the annuity comes to be payable. The first thing essential is that the exact premium should be ascertained ; the next, that it should be actually received. The scheme does not provide effectually for either the one requirement or the other. It mixes up the premium for the sick pay with that for the deferred annuity, and trusts to alterations in the premiums of future entrants to be made from time to time when periodical valuations show them to be necessary, to remedy any errors. But a moment's reflection will show, that no periodical valuation can affect the premium that ought to be paid for a deferred annuity. Until the deferred annuity is  
entered

entered upon, it is a mere matter of accumulating the premium at compound interest. The sick pay may vary from year to year, but the deferred annuity does not come to be a claim until fifty years after the contract has been made. If, by mixing up the premiums for the sick pay with those for the deferred annuity, the latter fund is made to bear the burden of any excess of sick pay in an unhealthy year, it suffers not merely by the actual cash sum abstracted from it, but by all the accumulations of that sum until the time for entering upon the annuity. 1*l.* paid down now would accumulate to 8*l.* in fifty years' time; and therefore if 1*l.* is unduly abstracted from the deferred annuity fund now, that fund will be deficient to the extent of 8*l.* when the annuity comes to be payable. If 6*l.* is the value of 4*s.* a week at age seventy, a loss of 1*l.* would reduce the pension to 3*s.* 4*d.*

We think that the distinction between an insurance and a tax is very important to be borne in mind, in the consideration of this matter. In an insurance, if it be on sound and just principles (and no other ought of course to be undertaken by the State), the premium ought to be as accurately adjusted to the risk as the conditions of the problem will allow. If it be an insurance against pauperism, supposing such an insurance to be at all practicable, the present value of the sum assured would have to be multiplied by the antecedent probability of the person insured becoming a pauper, and the result would be the premium that ought to be charged. If the probability of one person becoming a pauper is less than that of another person becoming one, he should pay a less premium. If he is charged the same premium, especially if he is compelled to pay it whether he will or not, the payment becomes a tax and not an insurance.

The reason this consideration is so important in its bearing on the present proposal is, that the whole moral effect of the scheme depends upon the light in which it is looked at by those who receive benefit under it. If they are led to suppose that they are insured persons when the premium they are paying is not adequate to the insurance, but is supplemented by a tax which other people are paying for their benefit, the moral advantage supposed to be offered by the scheme as a prophylactic against pauperism disappears altogether. They are paupers, and the pauperism is worse because all the old safeguards against it, which existed in the self-respect of the labouring classes, and their reluctance to claim relief provided out of the funds of others, have been done away with. The old Poor-law of Queen Elizabeth, when it enacted in effect that



no one should starve in this country, but that the cost of providing for those who cannot provide for themselves, should be met by the whole community, and the burden distributed among the members of it according to their several abilities to bear it, had these safeguards against abuse. The new Poor-law of Canon Blackley, which is to enact that every one who can establish a claim on the ground of poverty, may have four shillings a week for life after attaining the age of seventy, and that the cost of such annuity shall partly be met by the contributions of those who paid the same sum, but cannot by the conditions of the case obtain any benefit, would enable the receiver to become a burden upon other people, but relieve him from the shame.

The provisions for insuring the actual receipt of the premium are the next matter to be considered. The theory is, that the whole amount of the single premium for sick pay up to seventy years and for the deferred annuity thereafter, estimated loosely at 10*l.*, is to be paid by every individual before he attains 21 years of age. It is suggested that a payment of 1*s.* 3*d.* a week for three years would amount to the 10*l.*, and that every wage-earner could set aside out of his wages that sum between the ages of 18 and 21. If he will not do so, it is proposed that his employer should be compelled to deduct it from the wages when paid. From those who are not wage-earners, the 10*l.* is to be collected in the same way that other taxes are collected. In one way or other, every individual is to be made to pay.

With regard to the wage-earners, it is obvious that if the employer is to pay, he will be in the position of having to pay a youth of 20 years of age 1*s.* 3*d.* a-week more than he would have to pay a youth of 21 years of age. This, of course, he will not willingly do; and he can only be compelled to do it, if the labour-market is so ill-supplied that he cannot get a sufficient stock of workmen over 21 years of age to do his work. As long as the labour-market is in such a condition that men can be got to work at minimum wages, boys will not be employed at minimum wages, *plus* 1*s.* 3*d.* The plan in this respect may be left to work its own cure.

The demand is to be made from female wage-earners as well as from males. Every girl in the kingdom between the ages of 18 and 21 is to pay 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* a year. How is she to get it? Is female labour so highly paid that there is a margin left for investment after this rate? Is not the fact the very reverse of this? It is possible that the framer of the scheme has contemplated a state of society in which such an amount of saving would be barely practicable. What kind of female employment

ment offers such a margin of income? If there be any, is it wise or right to forbid the poor girl to apply her savings to that which is the legitimate ambition of every female—the giving herself, not wholly unprovided, to the man of her choice, with the little nest-egg that will help in plenishing their home? Why should the State insist upon her buying a deferred annuity which she does not want, and deprive her of the chance of happiness that is within her grasp? May she not justly ask that the want which may fall upon her when she is 70 should be left for the future to provide against, when the alternative is her falling into want that will hurt her more sorely when she is 20? What moral obligation rests upon her, or for the matter of that, upon any one whatever, to provide against the wants of the next half century when the want of the day is pressing? The amiable Canon who advocates the scheme shows a sad want of appreciation of perspective. To him the prospect of pauperism at 70 looms as large as the actuality of starvation now; but it is hardly likely to do so in the eye of the struggling poor.

Turning from these to the case of those who are not wage-earners, the injustice of the scheme becomes even more apparent. If the wage-earner will not pay, his employer must: he who earns no wages cannot pay: therefore his parent must. If this were a Malthusian device to impose a penalty on the father of a large family, something might be said in defence of it; but as the penalty is only to fall when the family is grown up, it may be held to be superfluous. The scheme is fallacious from every point of view: but probably the fallacy, which lies nearest the bottom of it, is that there is no other or better way of insuring against pauperism than that of buying a deferred annuity. The parent of a youth, who has not yet begun to earn his living, may be pardoned for thinking that, if he has given him the best education in his power, has apprenticed him to some trade or profession, has endeavoured to inculcate in him principles of prudence and right living, he has done something towards preventing his becoming a pauper at the age of seventy, and that the proposal to tax him 10*l.*, as a further provision against that risk, is an unjust interference with his right to form and act upon the best judgment he can for his child. One of the worst features of this scheme is its Socialistic phase: it assumes that all mankind have the same wants, and the same means of providing for them: indeed it claims to be founded on Prince Bismarck's theories of State Socialism. We are not sure that it would be any the better suited to English needs, if that were the fact: but the evidence of Dr. Aschrott tends to show,  
that

that it is not so. Prince Bismarck's scheme relates to the working-classes only, and is innocent of anything so absurd as the notion of universal insurance:—it does not involve the strange expedient of a single premium:—and it has nothing to say to a deferred annuity. These are the distinctive features of Canon Blackley's scheme: and not one of them appears in Prince Bismarck's. Even as regards the workmen, all that is required is that they should be members of some approved Friendly Society, not (except as regards accidents, and in that case only for certain specified trades) of any State institution whatever. Dr. Aschrott, indeed, said, 'I do not believe that we shall ever get a compulsory insurance for old age' (q. 1726); and again, 'I approve of all schemes which facilitate a man's securing a property of his own for his old age; and everything that prevents a man from using all the money he can spare in order to get a small property of his own I would oppose (q. 1729).' We confess that we entirely agree with this witness.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the scheme were carried into effect, what would be the consequence upon the Friendly Societies? It would cut off from them the supply of young members, for it is clear that no youth under twenty-one could afford to pay Friendly Society contributions in addition to his annual 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* It would thus deprive them of one material element of prosperity. With regard to the assurance of sick pay, in which at present the advantages of self-governing societies are the most apparent, it would limit their business to such additional and subsidiary assurance as would be required to meet the case of these members for whom eight shillings a week in sickness is not sufficient. It would probably therefore reduce the bulk of societies to mere Burial Societies, thus destroying the societies of the better classes, and bringing all societies to the level of the worse: for, as we have seen, the real source of the evils of Burial Societies is the smallness of each member's interest, giving him no substantial stake in the society's welfare and good management. If the scheme were in other respects a sound one, these consequences might well make us pause before adopting it: but bad as it is, they seem to us of themselves alone conclusive against it. It is not to socialistic Utopias of compulsory universal insurance, but to a continuance of the sound policy of encouragement of the last hundred years, that we look for the further progress of Friendly Societies.

- ART. V.—1. *The Fruit Manual*. By Robert Hogg, LL.D., F.L.S. Fifth edition. London, 1884.
2. *Report of the Committee of the National Apple Congress*. Compiled by A. F. Barron. London, 1884.
3. *Report of the Committee of the National Pear Conference*. Compiled by A. F. Barron. London, 1884.
4. *Vines and Vine Culture*. By A. F. Barron. London, 1887.
5. *Manuals on Market Gardens and Fruit Farming*. By Charles Whitehead. London, 1880–1884.
6. *Mushrooms for the Million*. By J. Wright, F.R.H.S. Fifth Edition. London, 1887.
7. *The Miniature Fruit Garden*. By Thomas Rivers. Nineteenth edition. London, 1886.
8. *Fruit Farming for Profit*. By George Bunyard, F.R.H.S. Maidstone, 1882.
9. *The Field Newspaper*. London, 1886 and 1887.
10. *The Agricultural Returns*, 1887.

IN previous numbers of this 'Review' we have dealt with wheat-growing, meat production, and dairy produce, mainly from a financial point of view; and it now remains to give the results of investigations respecting the cultivation on a large scale of culinary vegetables, fruit, trees and shrubs for replanting, flowers, and hops, commonly included under the comprehensive abbreviation which is adopted as the title of this article.

Unfortunately, the statistics of market gardens and fruit grounds are extremely unsatisfactory. The returns obtained by the Agricultural Department are insufficiently classified and incomplete; and no returns are included in the Agricultural Statistics for Ireland, except so far as the potato-crop is concerned. This omission is not the less to be regretted, because of the very small extent to which garden farming is attempted in Ireland. On the contrary, it is all the more desirable that figures should be given, in order that the neglect of a remunerative industry, for which the south of Ireland is peculiarly well suited, may be measured as well as known. As for the statistics for Great Britain and the small Islands, it is satisfactory to see that the officials responsible for them are aware of, and acknowledge, their imperfections and probable inaccuracy, while promising to effect an improvement, if possible, this year.

The following table shows the acreage returned as under market gardens, orchards, and nurseries, in the several divisions of Great Britain and the small Islands, in 1886 and 1887 respectively:—

MARKET

## MARKET GARDENS, ORCHARDS, and NURSERIES.

| Divisions.        | Market Gardens. |        | Orchards. |         | Nursery Grounds. |        |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|---------|------------------|--------|
|                   | 1886.           | 1887.  | 1886.     | 1887.   | 1886.            | 1887.  |
|                   | Acres.          | Acres. | Acres.    | Acres.  | Acres.           | Acres. |
| England .. .. .   | 55,630          | 57,572 | 195,071   | 196,986 | 10,705           | 10,705 |
| Wales .. .. .     | 718             | 860    | 3,341     | 3,408   | 267              | 267    |
| Scotland .. .. .  | 4,502           | 4,234  | 1,872     | 1,840   | 1,642            | 1,532  |
| Great Britain ..  | 60,850          | 62,666 | 200,284   | 202,234 | 12,614           | 12,478 |
| Isle of Man .. .. | 219             | 218    | 64        | 40      | 1                | 6      |
| Jersey .. .. .    | 174             | 97     | 1,165     | 1,015   | 36               | 23     |
| Guernsey, &c. ..  | 130             | 159    | 432       | 413     | 50               | 26     |
| Total .. .. .     | 61,373          | 63,140 | 201,945   | 203,702 | 12,701           | 12,533 |

The areas here given do not include small holdings or gardens under a quarter of an acre, with respect to which no statistics can be expected. Nor do they include larger plots of garden ground connected with houses, such as the great kitchen gardens and orchards of country gentlemen, in which considerable quantities of choice vegetables and fruit are grown, partly for sale. Ground covered with peas, potatoes, onions, carrots, parsnips, turnips, and vegetables of the cabbage tribe, where these are grown on a large scale, has no separate return. It is this omission which makes the area of market gardens in Jersey appear so small. But, no doubt, small growths of all these vegetables are included in the market-garden acreage. We may point out, too, that the acreage put down for market gardens in Jersey, in 1887, does not agree with the Parish Returns collected officially in the Island, which make it 345 *vergées*, or 153 acres. It will be understood, then, that the figures for market gardens give no idea of the extent of land devoted to culinary vegetables, large acreages of which are grown as ordinary farm crops, for market sale when prices are good enough, or for harvesting or feeding off when values are too low to cover the heavy extra expense of sending bulky produce into towns.

The figures for fruit are admitted to be imperfect. An attempt was made in 1887 to obtain the acreage of 'small fruit,' such as gooseberries and currants; a new heading being inserted in the schedule sent to occupiers of land, under which they were requested to give the acreage of small fruit grown in orchards, between standard trees. The acreage thus obtained—all of it included in the total for orchards—was 17,153 acres for England, 71 acres for Wales, 1252 acres for

for Scotland, 71 acres for the Isle of Man, 56 acres for Jersey, and 9 acres for Guernsey; making a total of 18,612 acres. But that there was a complete misapprehension as to the method of growing at least some kinds of small fruit is shown by the explanatory remarks, which assume that all small fruit not grown in orchards is grown in market gardens; whereas the truth is that the great bulk of strawberries and raspberries is not grown in either, but in open fields. In the neighbourhood of the Crays, Orpington, Halstead, Farningham, Swanley, and in other places in Kent, as well as in several other counties of England, and in Scotland, there are thousands of acres of strawberries and raspberries in open fields, and apparently none of the area of these crops is included in the Agricultural Returns, though the acreage of such fruit in market gardens is included.

With this explanation we may give the figures showing the increase in the areas of orchards, market gardens, and nurseries in Great Britain during the last twenty years, according to the Agricultural Returns:—

|                   | 1867.   | 1877.   | 1887.   |
|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                   | Acres.  | Acres.  | Acres.  |
| Market Gardens .. | 36,204  | 37,849  | 62,666  |
| Orchards.. ..     | 148,221 | 163,290 | 202,234 |
| Nurseries .. ..   | 11,779  | 11,952  | 12,478  |

The totals for 1887 do not correspond with those previously given, because the acreage for the small islands is not included in this comparative table. It will be noticed, that the increase in each division was much greater during the last decade than during the preceding one. In the ten years ending with 1877 there were increases of 1645 acres of market gardens, 15,079 acres of orchards, and 173 acres of nurseries; while in the last decade the areas were extended by 24,817 acres for market gardens, 38,944 acres for orchards, and 526 acres for nurseries. It is certain, however, that the increase in the acreage of land devoted to fruit has been much greater than is above indicated, as may be supposed from the explanation previously given. During the last ten years the small-fruit acreage has been widely extended.

Market gardening, as a matter of course, is most extensively carried on in counties near London, Birmingham, Manchester, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin, and other large towns. In England, Kent stands first with 9258 acres for 1887, Middlesex coming next with 7620 acres; and these are followed by Essex with 3680 acres, Bedford with 3593, Yorkshire with 3541, Worcester

Worcester with 3525, and Surrey with 3015; while Gloucester, Lancashire, and Hampshire come next with over 1500 acres each; and Sussex, Cheshire, Cornwall, Devon, Norfolk, Lincoln, have over a thousand each. Among the Welsh counties Glamorgan has the largest breadth of market-garden ground, 438 acres; Denbigh, with 292 acres, being the only other county in the Principality having over 50 acres. The largest areas in Scotland are 908 acres in Lanark, 831 in Edinburgh, 587 in Haddington, 433 in Aberdeen, 395 in Perth, and 271 in Forfar. Renfrew has 112 acres, and Bute 101; the figures for other Scotch counties being all under a hundred acres, though Fife and Ayr are close to that limit with 96 and 95 acres respectively.

In the case of fruit, climate and soil have more effect upon the selection of districts than contiguity to good markets; and in a return almost exclusively devoted to orchards, the great apple counties assume more than their due prominence in connection with the fruit supply, seeing that the apples grown in them are, to a great extent, devoted to the making of cider. Thus, in a table which gives the acreage occupied by fruit-trees with and without small fruit together, Hereford makes the greatest show with 27,008 acres, and is followed by Devon with 26,462, Somerset with 23,855, Worcester with 18,687, Kent with 18,030, and Gloucester with 15,911. Then there is a great drop to 5145 for Cornwall; and Dorset, Shropshire, and Monmouth are the only other counties having over 4000 acres of orchards. All but nine of the English counties, however, have each over a thousand acres, the exceptions being Bedford, Cumberland, Durham, Hants, Leicester, Northampton, Northumberland, Rutland, and Westmoreland. In Wales, Brecon alone has over a thousand acres; while in Scotland the largest area under orchards is 591 acres in Lanark, followed by 445 in Perth, 110 in Haddington, and 105 in Edinburgh. No other Scotch county has a hundred acres. If we take the acreage devoted to small fruit, grown with trees in orchards, the order of precedence is found to be very different, and this would be more strikingly the case if all small fruit were reckoned. In this connection Kent is far ahead of any other county, with 6495 acres, after which we come to 2013 acres for Middlesex, 1139 for Cambridge, 704 for Lancaster, 685 for Worcester, 589 for Devon, 551 for Yorkshire, 549 for Gloucester, and 500 for Norfolk; while Hereford, first in the other table, appears in this one with 80 acres only, and Somerset with no more than 75 acres. For all Wales only 71 acres are put down as the area devoted to small fruit grown in orchards. The greatest areas



areas for Scotland are 452 acres in Lanark, 206 in Haddington, 165 in Perth, and 127 in Aberdeen.

Nursery grounds are more equally distributed than market gardens or fruit grounds. Surrey, however, as it supplies the Metropolis to a great extent, is by far the largest area, 1452 acres; and Yorkshire is the only other county with over a thousand acres. Similarly in Scotland, Edinburgh has 432 acres of nurseries, and no other county has half that area.

The statistics relating to hops do not embody any great variations. The area was 64,284 acres in 1867, 71,239 in 1877, and 63,706 in 1887. The total for last year is made up as follows:—Kent, 40,037 acres; Sussex, 8729; Hereford, 6478; Hants, 3062; Worcester, 2828; Surrey, 2384; Shropshire, 101; Suffolk, 42; Notts, 14; Berks and Gloucester, 12 each; Herts and Hants, 3 each; and Essex, 1.

So far, we have dealt only with the information afforded by official statistics, and in this connection we have yet to give the figures relating to the most important of all culinary vegetables—the potato. The following table shows the changes in the acreage of the potato-crop, in the several divisions of the United Kingdom, during the last twenty years:—

AREA of the POTATO CROP.

|                   | 1867.     | 1877.     | 1887.     |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                   | Acres.    | Acres.    | Acres.    |
| England .. ..     | 289,611   | 303,964   | 369,243   |
| Wales .. ..       | 45,077    | 42,942    | 40,570    |
| Scotland .. ..    | 157,529   | 165,565   | 149,839   |
| Great Britain ..  | 492,217   | 512,471   | 559,652   |
| Ireland .. ..     | 1,001,781 | 873,291   | 796,939   |
| Isle of Man .. .. | 4,011     | 3,741     | 3,345     |
| Jersey .. ..      | 2,062     | 4,006     | 6,488     |
| Guernsey, &c. ..  | 789       | 1,044     | 877       |
| United Kingdom    | 1,500,860 | 1,394,553 | 1,367,301 |

These figures show a decrease during twenty years of over 133,000 acres in the United Kingdom, owing chiefly to the diminished cultivation of the potato crop in Ireland, and in spite of an increase in England and Jersey. It may be assumed that there is an increase rather than a decrease in the produce, because the yield in England and Jersey is much greater than it is in Ireland, besides which the crop is much less liable to injury from disease than it was formerly. Even in Ireland the produce

produce for 1887 is returned at 3,569,402 tons, as compared with 3,147,458 tons in 1867, in spite of the diminished area. It is true that last year's crop was over the average in Ireland; but in four out of the last five years the produce has been over 3,000,000 tons. For Great Britain the official records of yield have been given during the last four years only, during which period the annual produce has averaged over 3,400,000 tons. The 'ordinary average' yield per acre is estimated at 6·32 tons for England, 5·43 for Wales, 5·79 for Scotland, and 6·11 for Great Britain; while a ten years' average for Ireland is 3·30 tons. Taking acreage into account, in order to work out a true average, we find the average for the United Kingdom 4·41 tons per acre.

Since maize was extensively imported and wheat has become cheap, the people of Ireland have been much less dependent upon the potato crop than they were at an earlier period. The cheapness of wheat, again, has probably diminished the consumption of potatoes in Great Britain, for, as the home produce has not kept pace with the increase in population while the imports have fallen off greatly since 1880, the supply per head must have been reduced. The decline of potato-growing in Scotland, which is of recent date, may be attributed to the competition of growers in English counties near London, or other large towns, who have a great advantage over those distant from the great centres of consumption. To show the increased cultivation of the tuber in some of the counties, it is worth while to give the figures for those in which over ten thousand acres were grown in 1887, in order to show how the acreage in each has changed since 1877:—

GREAT POTATO-GROWING COUNTIES in ENGLAND.

|                  | 1877.  | 1887.  | Increase or<br>Decrease. |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------------------------|
|                  | Acres. | Acres. | Acres.                   |
| Yorkshire .. ..  | 43,246 | 47,246 | + 4,000                  |
| Lincoln .. ..    | 36,552 | 44,828 | + 3,336                  |
| Lancaster .. ..  | 33,783 | 40,553 | + 6,770                  |
| Chester .. ..    | 20,360 | 28,581 | + 8,221                  |
| Kent .. ..       | 13,576 | 15,870 | + 2,294                  |
| Devon .. ..      | 15,002 | 14,738 | - 264                    |
| Cambs .. ..      | 8,874  | 13,350 | + 4,476                  |
| Cumberland .. .. | 10,667 | 11,717 | + 1,050                  |
| Essex .. ..      | 10,103 | 10,668 | + 565                    |
| Staffs .. ..     | 7,276  | 10,611 | + 3,335                  |

It will be seen that, of the ten greatest potato counties in England, all but one have increased their cultivation of the crop during

during the last ten years. Let us now make a similar comparison for Scotland, taking the counties growing over five thousand acres each, as there are only three which produce over ten thousand acres:—

## GREAT POTATO-GROWING COUNTIES in SCOTLAND.

|                   | 1877.  | 1887.  | Increase or<br>Decrease. |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------------------------|
|                   | Acres. | Acres. | Acres.                   |
| Fife .. .. .      | 17,488 | 15,933 | - 1,555                  |
| Perth .. .. .     | 17,648 | 15,920 | - 1,728                  |
| Forfar .. .. .    | 15,365 | 14,944 | - 421                    |
| Ross and Cromarty | 9,195  | 9,472  | + 277                    |
| Aberdeen .. ..    | 7,644  | 8,413  | + 769                    |
| Ayr .. .. .       | 7,775  | 8,033  | + 258                    |
| Inverness .. ..   | 8,091  | 7,602  | - 489                    |
| Haddington .. ..  | 9,847  | 7,378  | - 2,469                  |
| Argyll .. .. .    | 6,566  | 6,085  | - 481                    |
| Lanark .. .. .    | 7,996  | 5,509  | - 2,487                  |
| Edinburgh .. ..   | 7,063  | 5,458  | - 1,605                  |

Here there is a decrease of area in eight out of eleven counties, and Haddington and Edinburgh are two of the three counties in which the contraction is greatest; no doubt, because the land has been devoted to more valuable crops. In Jersey there has been an advance from 4006 acres in 1877 to 6488 in 1887, or an increase of 67 per cent.; while in Guernsey the area has fallen from 1044 acres in the earlier to 877 in the later year.

Foreign competition in the supply of potatoes has of late diminished; prices have been so low in this country, that there has been no temptation to send us large quantities of common tubers after the bulk of the home supply is in the market. Indeed, bearing in mind the fact, that Jersey is part of the United Kingdom, it may safely be said that foreign competition in the supply of potatoes has been reduced within very narrow limits. In records of imports, however, the Channel Islands are classed with outside British possessions, and English growers of potatoes are apt to regard Jersey growers as foreign competitors. But, including the receipts from the Channel Islands, our imports of potatoes have fallen off from 7,964,840 cwt. in 1877 to 2,762,958 cwt. in 1887; while the decline since 1880, when we imported 9,754,514 cwt. of potatoes, has been in a still greater ratio. The proportion of the outside supply, including that of the Channel Islands, to the total supply is, indeed, very small. In Great Britain and Ireland we grow from 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons of potatoes annually, and we have imported only

only about 115,000 to 138,200 tons annually during the last three years. It is only in the supply of early potatoes that outside competition is formidable; and, in that respect, countries favoured with a warmer climate than our own have an advantage.

The latest year for which full details of imports are available is 1886, when the quantities and values of potatoes received from the several sources were as below:—

## IMPORTS of POTATOES in 1886.

| Source.                      | Quantity. | Value.   | Value per Ton. |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------------|
|                              | Cwt.      | £        | £ s. d.        |
| Channel Islands .. .. .      | 1,288,961 | 459,395  | 7 2 6          |
| France .. .. .               | 900,197   | 216,208  | 4 15 9         |
| Germany .. .. .              | 305,874   | 52,375   | 3 8 6          |
| Holland .. .. .              | 93,628    | 19,472   | 4 3 2          |
| Malta (early potatoes) ..    | 57,595    | 30,254   | 10 10 0        |
| Portugal .. .. .             | 32,841    | 15,573   | 9 9 8          |
| Belgium .. .. .              | 22,302    | 3,327    | 3 0 0          |
| Other Foreign Countries ..   | 6,452     | 2,645    | 8 3 9          |
| Other British Possessions .. | 44        | 16       | 7 5 6          |
| Totals and Average Price     | 2,707,889 | £799,265 | £5 18 0        |

In 1887 we imported 843,708 cwt. from France, 425,612 from Germany, and 1,493,638 from the Channel Islands and 'other countries,' not enumerated in the Board of Trade Returns for last December. The total was 2,762,958 cwt., and the value 974,133*l.*, or 7*l.* 1*s.* per ton on an average, thus showing a great advance in price as compared with the average for 1886. We have given the average price of imports from each source in 1886, because it indicates the comparative earliness or lateness of the supply; but there are details which are not to be derived from a mere comparison of prices, and for these and a great deal of other information we are indebted to two well-known Covent Garden salesmen, Mr. George Monro and Mr. John Bath.

Forced potatoes are received from the Channel Islands as early as January, when they sell, wholesale, at 6*d.* to 1*s.* per pound. The supply of unforced tubers from Algeria, Lisbon, and Malta, begins in March; and early in May, contributions come from Noirmoutier and the Oleron Isles, in the Bay of Biscay. In May, too, Guernsey sends considerable quantities, grown under glass without artificial heat. Mr. Monro alone sometimes sells as much as two tons per day, early in the month. The earliest new potatoes in great bulk come to London, from the Channel Islands

Islands and Cherbourg, in the second week of June, and, about the same time, from Cornwall and the Scilly Islands. The dates of the first arrivals vary, of course, with the seasons; those stated, or to be given, may be regarded as the normal periods. In some seasons, Cornwall potatoes are ready a few days earlier than the large supply of unforced Jersey tubers; while, in other years, the precedence is the other way. When the supply of English potatoes becomes large enough to send prices down to 6*l*. a ton—about the end of July—the supply from the Channel Islands mostly ceases for the season. It will be seen from details of rents and other expenses incurred by growers in those Islands, which we shall give when describing their garden farming, that they could not afford to produce potatoes to sell at the prices obtained for the bulk of the home supply. During the last two or three years, according to some of the best authorities, the average net price received by farmers in England and Scotland has not exceeded 50*s*. a ton. A great crop is necessary to yield a profit at such a price. From 10 to 15 tons per acre are sometimes produced on good and well-farmed land.

Turning now to the supply of other varieties of culinary vegetables, we notice first a peculiarity of the traffic mentioned by Mr. Whitehead in his 'Market Gardening for Farmers.' 'It is a curious fact,' he says, 'that the chief part of the vegetables grown in this country and in foreign countries is sent straight to London, as being a safe and almost certain market, and that many of the English towns are, to a great extent, supplied from London.' This, of course, is a great advantage to market gardeners near London. Nevertheless the statistics we have already given show, that large areas of market gardens exist in counties distant from the Metropolis.

Broccoli or cauliflowers are to be obtained all the year round. The distinction between the two is conveniently ignored to a great extent in the trade by the use of the term 'heads,' which includes both. There is indeed so little difference between late cauliflowers and early broccoli that it is not easy to distinguish them, and the difficulty is increased by the receipt from foreign sources of one variety, while the home supply of the other is still coming to market. The broccoli season is supposed to begin in December, or occasionally at the end of November, when considerable quantities arrive in London from Cornwall and Cherbourg. The supply from Cornwall is grown extensively near Penzance. Later on, large quantities are received from Kent, Middlesex, Surrey, Berks, and Oxford, including the market gardens near London. Cauliflowers come chiefly from the

the same districts. Holland sends broccoli, but not a very large quantity.

Cabbages, coleworts, and Brussels sprouts, are almost exclusively of English growth, and are received chiefly from the counties which supply broccoli. Cabbages, of one class or other, are forthcoming all the year round.

Forced asparagus is to be obtained in London all through December and January, when they sell at 15s. to 30s. a bundle. The first supply of natural growth comes at about the second week in February, from the north of Spain; Pampeluna being a noted district for this crop. The French crop is ready early in March; the best, which is probably the finest in the world, being grown at Argenteuil and other districts near Paris. A small quantity comes from Antwerp. English asparagus, from Hounslow, Sawbridgeworth, Cambridgeshire, Herts, Kent, Worthing, and the Evesham district, begins to arrive at the end of April. Although foreigners, who contribute the early supply, have a great advantage over home growers, it is safe to assume that, where grown under the new system, on the flat, instead of on raised beds, which are very costly to make, the asparagus crop must be highly remunerative at prices current in this country, and that its cultivation might be largely extended.

In April and May, lately, considerable quantities of green peas have been sent to London from Guernsey, where they are raised in glass houses without artificial heat. This is a comparatively new and a rapidly increasing form of enterprise. Last year the supply was three times as much as in any previous year, and the price realized was 1s. a pound in the pod. Guernsey peas are greatly superior to French, which come plentifully through May and June. The latter are grown chiefly in Algeria and the South of France. English peas are ready in considerable quantities by the third week in June, and from the Home Counties small lots come earlier.

French beans, grown in the Channel Islands in hot-houses, are sent to London as early as January, and some are obtained from Paris at the same period of the year. The trade in these very early beans is an increasing one, a hundred baskets of 15 lb. to 18 lb. being frequently disposed of in a day by one salesman. The French supply is kept up till the end of June, as the bulk of the English produce is not ready till July.

Sea-kale is grown round London and in Cornwall for the London market, no foreign supply of appreciable quantity being received. It may also be said generally of vegetables not named above, except onions, that the supply is nearly all English, although early carrots and a few other productions not  
already

already referred to come from France. Carrots, parsnips, turnips, and vegetable marrows, are extensively produced in all the market-garden districts of the country. Onions for bulbing are largely grown by farmers in Bedfordshire, as well as by market gardeners in all parts of England; but they are also extensively imported. In 1877 the imports of onions amounted to 1,964,234 bushels, and they have been almost constantly increasing since, until, last year, the large quantity of 3,649,471 bushels was reached. Seeing what immense quantities of foreign onions are sold at marvellously low prices under the name of 'Spanish,' it is somewhat surprizing to notice the small proportion of the supply that comes from Spain.

Through the winter salad vegetables are sent to London, chiefly from Paris; but radishes are imported from Guernsey, early in January, and from Boulogne, at the beginning of April. The price of even the early portion of the radish supply is not high, those sent from Guernsey in January being commonly sold at 1s. to 1s. 6d. per dozen bunches, double the size of an English bunch. English radishes are supplied freely in May, chiefly from the districts within twenty miles round London. Paris sends us lettuces all through the winter, English coming in about the middle of May. The celery we consume is nearly all of home growth, the London supply being principally from the Home Counties and Lincolnshire.

Mushroom-growing is becoming quite a popular industry, not only for professional gardeners, but for amateurs also; in great measure among the latter through the publication of Mr. Wright's book on the subject, which has rapidly reached a fifth edition. With this volume in his hands, any intelligent man can grow abundance of mushrooms even in a small garden, yard, shed, or cellar, and the returns are highly remunerative when the produce is sold. The system of growing the savoury fungus in the open air in this country, on raised beds protected by straw, is made clear, and the mushrooms produced are much finer than those raised in French caverns, as in the Catacombs at Paris. The market supply of mushrooms is nearly all of home growth, the principal exception being a limited quantity which is sent from the Paris Catacombs. They are grown all the year round, and are often most plentiful in winter, because it is possible to protect them against cold on outside beds, but not against heat, except in caverns. The price for full-sized fungi varies from 6d. to 1s. per lb. wholesale. June is the month in which the price is highest, and then 'buttons' sell at 2s. to 3s. per lb. Mr. Wright describes the mushroom crop as the most remunerative out-door crop grown. On an acre of



ground covered with mushroom beds, he calculates, a year's produce, at an average of 1s. per lb., would be worth no less than 1452*l.*, while the cost of production would be only 484*l.* without rent. Allowing 12*l.* per acre for rent, including half an acre extra for preparing manure, he brings out a clear profit of 950*l.* an acre. A famous grower, Mr. Barter, actually produced from 500 lineal yards of beds, covering very little over a quarter of an acre, in one year, 7356 lbs. of mushrooms, which realized 375*l.* 6*s.* A still more remarkable result is recorded by Mr. Dunn, gardener to Colonel Gascoigne, of Parlington Hall, Leeds, who produced 3014 lbs. from 122 lineal yards of beds, covering about one-sixteenth of an acre, and sold them for 106*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.*, or at the rate of over 1600*l.* an acre. There is failure sometimes, but almost invariably through mismanagement.

According to a good authority on market-gardening in Scotland, Mr. John Speir, of Newton, near Glasgow, the largest district in that country set apart for culinary vegetables lies along the sea-shore from Prestonpans to Edinburgh, and around the city itself. Next in importance is the district immediately surrounding Glasgow, which extends up the Clyde as far as Hamilton, and down the river to Dumbarton. Smaller districts are near the Clyde coast watering-places, Falkirk, Perth, and Aberdeen. In the Edinburgh district every vegetable, for which the climate of Scotland is suitable, is cultivated; whereas round Glasgow the crops are less various, chiefly consisting of turnips, cabbages, onions, leeks, cauliflowers, sprouts, peas, beans, carrots, and salad. The people of Glasgow, it appears, are very large consumers of cabbage, and a large area of that vegetable is devoted to the supply of the city. The best market-garden ground near Edinburgh is let at 5*l.* to 10*l.* the Scotch acre, according to fertility, shelter, and access to market. Near Glasgow the rents are from 3*l.* to 3*l.* 10*s.* per English acre, without buildings.

In Ireland there are no extensive market-garden districts, except near Dublin, Belfast, and Cork, though the south of the country is admirably fitted for the production of early vegetables, and some kinds of fruit. By far the largest gardens are those in the neighbourhood of Dublin, from which, according to Professor Carroll, of Glasnevin, large quantities of vegetables are exported to Scotland during the autumn, winter, and spring. Curled broccoli are grown to a considerable extent, too, in the North of Ireland, in the potato fields, either on the edges of the beds, or in lines across the ridges. There is nothing, however, that strikes an Englishman visiting Ireland for the first time more forcibly, than the lack of kitchen as well as of flower gardens.

gardens. The potato is the only culinary vegetable commonly consumed by the Irish peasantry.

Foreign competition in the supply of vegetables to our markets has unquestionably increased. No quantities are given in the official returns for other vegetables than potatoes and onions, the figures for which we have already quoted; but the value of unenumerated raw vegetables imported has been almost constantly rising for more than twenty years. In 1859 the value was 24,379*l.*; in 1867 it was still as low as 68,644*l.*, but rose suddenly to 134,376*l.* in the following year. After a brief period of fluctuation, the value stood at 132,124*l.* in 1875, and since that year there has been an unbroken annual increase up to 1887, when the amount was 600,882*l.* The sources of supply, and the proportions in which they severally contribute, may be seen from the following details for 1886, the latest year for which they are available:—

## IMPORTS OF UNENUMERATED VEGETABLES in 1886.

| From                  |          | From                |          |
|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|
|                       | £        |                     | £        |
| France .. .. .        | 294,848  | Brought forward     | 517,731  |
| Channel Islands .. .. | 92,632   | Italy .. .. .       | 8,854    |
| Holland .. .. .       | 64,307   | Denmark .. .. .     | 3,463    |
| Germany .. .. .       | 21,944   | Belgium .. .. .     | 3,422    |
| United States .. ..   | 20,627   | Austria .. .. .     | 3,336    |
| Spain .. .. .         | 14,325   | Chili .. .. .       | 2,487    |
| Portugal .. .. .      | 9,048    | Other sources .. .. | 1,377    |
| Carried forward ..    | £517,731 | Total .. .. .       | £540,670 |

Considerable as the increase in imports has been, the proportion of the foreign to the home supply must be very small. For the most part the foreign vegetables, and those sent from the Channel Islands, come to us before the home supply is ready; for when the great bulk of native vegetables comes into the markets, prices are too low for importing. Native growers complain that outsiders 'take the cream off the market,' by meeting the demand of the wealthy for high-priced early vegetables before the earliest of the home supply is ready; and this is mainly true. On the other hand, it is to be observed that the Paris district, which contributes a large proportion of the foreign supply, has scarcely any advantage in respect of climate over the districts round London, and none at all over many parts of the Southern Counties. It is mainly through the use of glass, including the bell glasses (*cloches*), that the Parisian gardeners are able to forestall our own, and this is in great part

the case also with growers in the Channel Islands, who, however, have some advantage in climate over most of our market gardeners. Climate tells chiefly in respect of the contributions from Algeria, the South of France, Spain, and Portugal; but the great advance lately made by Guernsey in supplying us with early vegetables of certain kinds, above alluded to, shows what can be done with glass.

The prices of the various vegetables depend so greatly upon the character of the season, that it is difficult to ascertain whether there has been a general fall or a general rise during any period of years. A comparison of a weekly list of wholesale prices published by Mr. John Bath, of Covent Garden, for the middle of April, May, June, and July in 1884 and 1887, respectively, shows a fall upon some vegetables and a rise on others, the fall being most frequent. Growers are pretty well unanimous in stating, that their business is less profitable than it was a few years back; but many of them attribute the fall in prices more to increased home competition than to foreign supplies. Mr. Harvey Hunt, an extensive salesman in the important Evesham district, where all the vegetables in common use are grown on a large scale, says that vegetable-growing is being overdone; and other authorities express the same opinion. Probably this is true of the more common vegetables, such as cabbages, turnips, and onions, which are grown to a considerable extent by ordinary farmers, rather than of the crops which are cultivated for sale almost exclusively by market gardeners. On the other hand, Mr. Whitehead and others contend, not only that the home supply would not be too large, if we had a better system of distribution, but that it might well be increased to a great extent. The fact, that rail charges and the salesman's commission often balance, and sometimes exceed, the amount realized by vegetables sent to market, is alone a strong indictment against the existing system. It is to be observed, moreover, that in seasons of the greatest plenty, when the markets are supposed to be glutted, and growers get extremely small prices, millions of the population are short of vegetables on their dinner-tables. The poor can buy vegetables more cheaply in the markets of the East of London and in such great centres as Manchester and Birmingham, to which large supplies are constantly consigned, than in the small towns or even in the villages of the rural districts. People who require the greengrocer to call for orders, and afterwards to send to their houses vegetables worth a few pence, must expect to pay more than double, or perhaps four times what the grower receives; but there should be markets in all towns where the poor can obtain their supplies at much

much less than greengrocers' ordinary charges. Mr. Hunt says, that rail rates for green stuff from Evesham to many places, including London, are prohibitive, and are very high for everything; also that small growers are placed at a special disadvantage, by the large extra charges on small quantities of produce. It is a common complaint, too, that the rail charges on vegetables for short distances in this country are much higher comparatively, and in some cases absolutely higher, than the rates for the same kinds of produce imported from France or Holland. Another grievance is that, whereas the foreign produce is conveyed by fast boats and express trains, the home supply of vegetables is mostly carried by goods trains, and 'shaken and smashed up,' as Mr. Whitehead expresses it, 'by the bumping and banging occasioned by "picking up" at the various stations.'

In spite of all disadvantages, however, market gardeners appear to have suffered much less than ordinary farmers from the depression, which has lately prevailed in all, or nearly all, branches of industry. Their expenses are heavy; but their returns are often large, and sometimes enormous. When a competition took place among those of the market gardeners near London, who chose to enter for prizes offered by the Mansion House Committee in connection with the International Agricultural Show held at Kilburn in 1879, the rents of the competitors, according to Mr. Whitehead, ranged from 2*l.* 2*s.* to 6*l.* per acre, the cost of labour from 11*l.* to 14*l.*, and that of manure from 9*l.* to over 11*l.* On an average, he estimated the expenses of market gardeners at about 30*l.* an acre. Very little reduction appears to have taken place in the rents, as far as we are able to ascertain, and the total expenses are probably nearly as high as they were when Mr. Whitehead wrote. At that time market gardeners were in a highly prosperous condition, their returns on certain crops being occasionally very large, instances of 80*l.*, 90*l.*, 100*l.*, and 150*l.* per acre, being cited in the Report on the Prize Market Gardens. It is seldom, we fear, that such returns, or anything like them, are obtained now. In many places distant from a large town, market gardens or market-garden farms have been converted into ordinary farms. The statistics we have quoted, however, show that the acreage in the country has increased, and we believe that market gardening is still fairly profitable, where it is well done, and where the situation is sufficiently advantageous.

Turning now to the fruit supply, we may refer to the statistics already given, as indicating the counties which produce the largest proportions. Apples are chiefly grown at home; though imports from the United States and Canada, and

and to a smaller extent from Paris and Holland, have increased in recent years. The English supply to London begins with Julians and Keswicks in June, and is kept up in bulk till the end of January, after which the quantities received are very small. The great majority of growers sell their apples as soon as they have been gathered, and thus frequently cause a glut in the markets, much to their disadvantage. Comparatively few have proper storage chambers, in which the fruit can be kept till it will command a higher price, than when nearly every one who has any to dispose of is selling. Another great defect in the marketing of apples is careless or neglected sorting and bad packing. In a barrel of American or Canadian apples the fruit is all of a fair size, the small apples not being considered worth sending; and there is no difference in the sample at the top and at the bottom of a barrel. This is an instance of honesty being the best policy; for buyers have perfect confidence, when they see a good display of fruit at the top of the barrel, that they will find all good alike. Too many English growers, we regret to say, not only allow a great many small fruit to be sent with their consignments, thus diminishing the value, but are apt to put the best apples on top. The plan is a doubly mistaken one; for, in the first place, the large fruit alone would probably realize as much as the large and small together, so that growers might as well keep their small apples for cider or for the pigs, instead of paying rail freight upon them, for which they will get no return; and, secondly, buyers are in the habit of allowing for expected inferiority in the bulk compared with what they see on the top of the package. The chief fault, however, of the home apple supply lies in the inferior quality of the great bulk of it. All authorities agree in the opinion, that the demand for choice apples is practically unlimited, or, at any rate, that no amount of planting of choice varieties is likely to overtake the demand for many years to come. All but a very small proportion of the large area devoted to apple orchards in this country is occupied with trees, which are either inferior varieties or too old to produce remunerative crops. The lack of legal security for tenants' capital invested in planting is largely accountable for this state of things; but it does not explain the neglect of planting on the part of landowners. We do not mean to say that planting has been entirely neglected, for in recent years thousands of acres of new fruit grounds, including apple orchards, have been planted with choice varieties. The fact remains, however, that the proportion of orchard land growing the best sorts is still very small. This is certainly not for the lack

lack of available information upon the subject. Dr. Hogg's valuable 'Fruit Manual,' which includes a complete classification of apples, and a description of all the best varieties of other fruits as well, was first published twenty-seven years ago, and has since passed through many editions, with added information, bringing it up to date in respect of anything new connected with its subject. This is the standard work on fruit; but there are numbers of smaller books, which afford sufficient information to those who desire to know what are the best varieties to plant in different parts of the country. One of the most valuable, and the most full of instructive details for growers of apples in the United Kingdom, is the Report of the Committee of the National Apple Congress, held in 1883, compiled by Mr. Barron, Superintendent of the Royal Horticultural Society's Gardens, Chiswick, and published under the title, 'British Apples.' Among numerous manuals, giving instruction as to culture as well as with respect to choice of sorts, we may mention Mr. Charles Whitehead's 'Profitable Fruit Farming,' Mr. Bunyard's 'Fruit Farming for Profit,' and the valuable and remarkably popular book brought out by Mr. Rivers, of Sawbridgeworth, under the name of 'The Miniature Fruit Garden,' a title which by no means indicates the scope of the information given in it by one of the greatest improvers of fruit-growing in this or in any other country.

With respect to the imports of apples, the records date only as far back as 1882, previous to which year this variety of fruit was classed with 'raw fruit not otherwise described.' Judging from the difference made in the quantity of other raw fruit when apples were taken out of the total, it is probable that in 1877 we imported about 1,500,000 bushels. In 1882 the quantity was 2,386,805 bushels, and in 1886 it was 3,261,460 bushels. In 1887 the imports fell to 1,948,843 bushels, chiefly, no doubt, because the crop in America was a small one. Of the total received in 1886, the United States contributed 1,647,052 bushels, or just about one-half; Belgium, nearly 599,000; Canada, 477,134; France, nearly 290,000; Holland, 104,142; and Portugal, Germany, and the Channel Islands, smaller quantities. Mr. Whitehead says that, although 500 bushels of apples per acre have been grown where the trees were in their prime, seven years' average in Kent would be about 130 bushels. Our imports in 1886, then, at this rate, were equivalent to the produce of about 25,000 acres of orchards producing as much as those of Kent; and the value of the imports, 857,095*l.*, is equal to over 34*l.* an acre on the area just stated. That this large foreign supply could be profitably superseded



superseded by apples of home growth, there is no reason to doubt. Continental growers have certainly no advantage over home growers, and in America the only advantage is cheap land, which is more than balanced by the extra dearthness of labour there and the cost of transport to this country. The best of English apples, moreover, are the best in the world. It may be concluded, then, that no landowner who has capital for the purpose need hesitate to plant the best varieties of apples, or to give his tenants security for planting them.

Our supply of pears is principally of native growth. A small quantity of early fruit comes from France in May, and larger supplies of late sorts during the winter, when the Rhine Valley also contributes. In February and March, when there are scarcely any English pears in the markets, French and Belgian growers send over their keeping varieties and realize very high prices, sometimes as much as 12s. to 18s. a dozen. Worcestershire, Herefordshire, Somersetshire, and Devonshire, are the counties in which pears in orchards are most extensively grown; but in Kent the fruit has lately been planted, with bush fruit, to a considerable extent. In the great orchard counties, however, many of the pears are produced for making perry, and the choice varieties are grown chiefly in gardens in various parts of Great Britain. The surplus fruit from large private gardens forms a considerable proportion of the market supply. The best sorts of pears, and especially the keeping varieties, are a luxury for the rich, selling at such high prices, that their production is highly lucrative to those persons who know how to cultivate pear-trees, and have a large number in full bearing. No doubt pears are less hardy than apples, their early period of blossoming being a peculiar danger in such a fickle climate as ours; but in an average of seasons this delicious fruit pays well for cultivation, and its production should be largely extended.

Rhubarb is a product in respect of which there is no foreign competition. In a strict classification it would be placed among the vegetables; but as it is used as a fruit, it is commonly classed with fruit. The Americans compromise the difficulty, by terming it the 'pie-plant.' That which is forced is sent to London from about Christmas, chiefly from Yorkshire, where the forcing system is carried to great perfection, with highly profitable results. Glasgow is another great centre of rhubarb growing, and particularly forcing; Edinburgh being the only other extensive place of artificial cultivation. Unforced rhubarb is supplied from market gardens round London, from Kent, and from the Wisbech district; the earliest in a normal season being forthcoming about the middle of February. It is also grown extensively



extensively in the neighbourhood of Dublin for the manufacture of 'British Wines.'

Gooseberries are nearly all of English growth, though a few are sent to us from Paris in May. The Exeter district supplies the earliest of English growth, usually in May; while in the latter part of that month and in June the Isle of Sheppey, and the Sandwich and Deal districts contribute. The main supplies for London come from Kent, Evesham, Cambridgeshire, and Middlesex. The currants we consume are also nearly all of home production, the quantity contributed by Holland and France being inappreciable. Kent and Cambridgeshire are the principal sources of the London supply.

The earliest strawberries are those forced by English market gardeners, and in gentleman's hothouses. The first appearance of the fruit in market is in March, when it is usually worth from 3s. to 6s. a pound. In May strawberries come in quantities from Honfleur, the best in baskets holding 10 lbs. to 12 lbs., which are sold at 10s. to 30s. a basket. Mr. George Monro alone sells 1000 lbs. to 1500 lbs. a day during May. Inferior fruit, in 'boats,' holding 3 lbs. each, is sold in Covent Garden to the extent of 1200 boats a day during the same month. English strawberries in bulk arrive, from Kent and Wisbech principally, in the last week of June. The most extensive strawberry fields in this country are in West Kent, where many growers have over a hundred acres each, and some several hundreds of acres. This fruit is also largely grown near Southampton. The Clyde Valley, from Lanark to Hamilton, is the most extensive strawberry district in Scotland. The valley is about two miles wide, and the land on either side rises abruptly from the river, affording excellent shelter. Seven or eight miles of this valley are entirely devoted to fruit, the strawberry occupying by far the largest area. Last season was a good one for the district, and as many as thirty tons of strawberries a day were sent from it to Glasgow during the period of the greatest plenty. This fruit is also extensively grown near Crieff and Aberdeen, and, with other fruit, in the Carse of Gowrie. The only extensive cultivation of strawberries in Ireland is that carried on in the Cork district, whence considerable quantities are sent to Dublin and Bristol. A crop of strawberries in West Kent, according to Mr. Albert Bath, who has been an extensive grower, varies from 1½ to 3 tons per acre. In the 'palmy days' of strawberry growing, Mr. Whitehead says, poor woodland in Kent, on which the underwood of twelve or fourteen years' growth was never worth more than 7l. to 8l. an acre, yielded in some instances as much as 150l. an acre,

acre, after being grubbed up and planted with strawberries. When we come to the fall in prices of fruit, it will be seen that no such return can be expected now.

Raspberries are extensively grown in West Kent; as well as near Maidstone, Gravesend, Rainham, Faversham, Sandwich, and Wisbech. Considerable quantities are produced in the Evesham district; most of these being sent to Birmingham. A few raspberries are imported from Paris; but there is no foreign competition worth mentioning in respect of this fruit.

The remark, as to the lack of serious foreign competition in relation to raspberries, also applies to plums, which are largely cultivated in Kent, Cambridgeshire, and Evesham. After the English supply is over, a few plums come from the Rhine Valley and from Saxony. Other varieties of hardy stone fruit, such as damsons, are almost exclusively of home production. With respect to more delicate varieties, the earliest peaches, nectarines, and apricots are forced in gentlemen's and market gardens, the earliest being sent to London in April. Mr. Rivers, of Sawbridgeworth, who has been a pioneer in the introduction of orchard houses, has produced in one of these glass structures, 100 feet by 24 feet, crops of 3500 to 4000 peaches and nectarines during the last thirty years. Paris supplies some unforced fruit of these kinds at the end of July, but they are not equal to English in flavour. The same may be said of greengages, of which the London supply comes chiefly from Kent, Worcestershire, and Cambridgeshire, and the foreign from Paris. The cherry orchards of Kent are famous throughout the world, and we scarcely need to state, that they supply London with the bulk of this delicious fruit. According to Mr. Whitehead, cherry orchards are highly profitable, although great rents are charged for them. Kent is also the great source of supply for filberts and cob-nuts, and, with other counties near London, for walnuts also, though a few filberts are received from Paris, and some walnuts from Grenoble. Chestnuts, on the other hand, are nearly all of foreign growth.

Of all recent developments in fruit production, that of tomatoes and grapes is the most striking. These fruits are usually produced by the same growers, and to a great extent in the same glass-houses, the custom being, in England and Guernsey alike, to grow tomatoes with the vines until the latter have completely covered the glass, after which the houses are usually devoted to grapes alone. The most extensive English grower is Mr. Philip Ladd, of Swanley and Bexley Heath, in Kent, who has miles of glass-houses filled with tomatoes and grapes. It is satisfactory to learn, that this enterprising

enterprising grower, in common with many others in England and Scotland, is able to hold his own against even the Guernsey producers, who, however, still supply the London market with most of the tomatoes and hothouse-grapes. English tomatoes, which are cultivated on a considerable scale in Cornwall, Cambridgeshire, and all round London, as well as in Kent, are now to be had all the year round. They are most scarce and dear in February and March, when the wholesale price is commonly 2*s.* to 3*s.* per pound, falling to 1*s.* to 2*s.* in April, to 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* in May, and to 9*d.* to 1*s.* in June. In the autumn the wholesale price falls to 3*d.* or 4*d.*, and even in January old fruit may be obtained at about 1*s.* a pound. The Guernsey, as well as the English, supply increases every year, and there are also smaller contributions of tomatoes from the South of Europe, where they are grown outdoors. The outdoor crop in this country is too uncertain to be relied on, but does well in the South of England in hot summers.

A few years ago, as Mr. Barron points out in his valuable book on Vines, hothouse-grapes could only be obtained by the wealthy in small quantities; whereas now they form a staple article of commerce, and can be bought all the year round, and usually at moderate prices. The principal cause of the increased supply is the great popularity obtained by the tomato, for as tomatoes produce an immediate return for the outlay on glass-houses during the period which is required for vines in the same houses to come into profit, the chief obstacle to enterprize in grape-growing has been removed. Other causes are the introduction of late-keeping grapes and the knowledge of the art of keeping the bunches in bottles. The approximate London supply of English hothouse-grapes in 1886, according to Mr. Barron, was 400 tons, Mr. George Monro alone having disposed of about 250 tons in that year. From the Channel Islands—chiefly from Guernsey—the supplies to London are constantly increasing. In 1876 they amounted to only 50 tons; whereas in 1886 the total was over 500 tons. Growers are satisfied to sell a ton of grapes at 2*s.* or 3*s.* a pound where they formerly sold a few hundred pounds at 10*s.* to 20*s.* A list of prices taken by Messrs. Webber and Co., of Covent Garden, from their grape-book, shows a range of 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* a pound in August, the cheapest month, for best black grapes, to from 5*s.* to 12*s.* in March and April, the dearest months; while the corresponding figures for second quality were 9*d.* to 1*s.* 3*d.*, and 3*s.* 6*d.* to 4*s.* Mr. Monro's prices for 1887 ranged from 8*d.* to 1*s.* in August and September to from 4*s.* to 12*s.* in March and April. Common grapes, grown in greenhouses without

without artificial heat, or in the open air, are sold at 3*d.* to 8*d.* in the autumn months. An experimental open-air vineyard, planted for wine-making by the Marquis of Bute, at Castle Coch, in Wales, is declared by the 'Journal of Horticulture' to have proved successful in recent hot seasons. Vast quantities of cheap grapes come to London from Spain and Portugal. The bulk of the home supply to Covent Garden is sent by a few large professional growers, and from a multitude of private establishments. Mr. Ladd alone sent about 50 tons in 1887. Some idea of the increase in the London receipts of grapes, tomatoes, and other forced products, may be gained from Mr. Monro's statement, that he had 10,000 packages consigned to him in June, 1887, as compared with 2648 in June, 1882.

For the reason already given in the case of apples, the official records of imports of unenumerated kinds of fruit do not carry us further back than 1882, when the total receipts in the United Kingdom were 2,614,046 bushels. In the face of what has above been stated respecting the great increase of choice fruit sent to London, it is somewhat puzzling to see a slight decrease in the total since 1884; the imports of unenumerated fruit since 1882 having been 2,160,475 bushels in 1883, 2,381,960 in 1884, 2,822,401 in 1885, 2,601,334 in 1886, and 2,479,904 in 1887. It is clear from these figures that, if foreign competition in choice fruit has increased, that in common fruit has diminished. The following table indicates the proportionate contributions of the several foreign countries and British possessions to our miscellaneous raw fruit supply:

IMPORTS OF UNENUMERATED RAW FRUIT, 1886.

| Source.                | Bushels.  | Value.     |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|
|                        |           | £          |
| Spain .. .. .          | 906,095   | 396,538    |
| France .. .. .         | 537,670   | 437,667    |
| Holland .. .. .        | 371,962   | 146,867    |
| Germany .. .. .        | 342,560   | 102,238    |
| Belgium .. .. .        | 229,367   | 71,311     |
| Portugal .. .. .       | 82,230    | 37,410     |
| Channel Islands ..     | 52,059    | 39,526     |
| Azores .. .. .         | 23,076    | 23,090     |
| British West Indies .. | 18,306    | 12,219     |
| Madeira .. .. .        | 12,605    | 11,156     |
| United States .. ..    | 9,163     | 5,424      |
| Italy .. .. .          | 5,408     | 2,069      |
| Canary Islands .. ..   | 4,653     | 2,301      |
| Malta .. .. .          | 2,932     | 955        |
| Other Countries ..     | 3,248     | 1,443      |
| Total .. .. .          | 2,601,334 | £1,290,214 |

Writing

Writing in 1884, and referring to the statistics of 1883 and previous years, Mr. Whitehead estimated the annual average produce of English (meaning British) fruit land at 'something like 9,000,000 bushels,' including apples. From this quantity he deducted 3,000,000 bushels of apples and pears grown for cider and perry, leaving only 6,000,000 bushels. The average imports were then about 4,000,000 bushels, so that the home and foreign supply, according to the estimate, amounted to only about 10,000,000 bushels, to make all the jam, and to supply all the fresh fruit consumed, raw or cooked, by a population which then numbered over 35½ millions. The home production has since increased—especially that of soft fruit; but probably the total home and foreign supply, even now, does not allow one-third of a bushel to each inhabitant. It is clear, that there is no absolute over-production, and that, if prices have fallen to a serious extent, the fault lies in an imperfect system of distribution, and not in the glutting of the demand. The fact is that, for the people as a whole, there is, as far as fruit is concerned, something like starvation in the midst of plenty.

In considering the fall in prices, the ordinary market quotations are not by themselves sufficient to enable us to arrive at correct conclusions; for these quotations represent the prices of only a small proportion of the total production of many varieties of fruit, the qualities being above the average. The bulk of the soft fruit and large quantities of apples are bought by the jam manufacturers directly from the growers, at prices much below those realized for choice fruit sent in 'punnets' and other packages to market. We have obtained from some of the largest producers in Kent the prices per ton which they declare

PRICES per Ton received by LARGE GROWERS.

|                   | 1883.    | 1886.    | 1887.    |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                   | £        | £        | £        |
| Strawberries ..   | 26 to 28 | 12 to 20 | 15 to 20 |
| Raspberries ..    | 35 „ 45  | 10 „ 18  | 11 „ 18  |
| Gooseberries ..   | 9        | 4½       | 9        |
| Red Currants ..   | 25 to 28 | 10       | 10       |
| Black Currants .. | 25 „ 28  | 10 to 14 | 10 to 14 |
| Plums .. ..       | 12 „ 16  | 4        | 5 „ 8    |
| Damsons .. ..     | 20       | 3 to 4   | 6 „ 8    |

to have been fair averages in different years. Until after 1885 prices were generally satisfactory, and fruit-growing was a highly profitable business; but the enormous crop of 1886 brought about a great fall in values, from which there was a partial

partial recovery in 1887. To explain the wide range of values for some kinds of fruit, we may state, that contracts with growers are commonly made before the crops are ready, and that, when the produce exceeds or falls below expectations, there is often a great difference between early and late prices.

In confirmation of the prices stated for strawberries and raspberries in 1887, we mention that Crosse and Blackwell's contract price for both kinds of fruit in that year was 16*l.* a ton. Great as the drop in value above indicated is, there are circumstances which must be taken into account in estimating its true significance. The enormous production in 1886 overstocked the jam factories; and the recovery in the following year, when the yield of fruit generally was moderate, was therefore less than it otherwise would have been. Growers grumble, of course; but some of them plant more fruit while grumbling, thus showing, in the most forcible manner, that they are hopeful as to the future. The best authorities believe the industry to be still profitable, though less so than formerly.

During the past year several jam factories have been established by fruit-growers in Kent. This is a movement of approximation between producers and consumers, and it can scarcely fail to benefit both. We believe the first grower to open a jam factory was Mr. Wilkins, of Tiptree, Essex: but soon afterwards, in 1884, Lord Sudeley, through the agency of Messrs. Beach and Sons, established a jam factory on his fruit farm of 480 acres, at Toddington, near Cheltenham. The fruit farm was started in 1880, and already the production of fruit is about 250 tons per annum, all kinds that are made into jam being grown. We understand that Lord Sudeley is entirely satisfied with his experiment in fruit planting, and the jam factory, which has just been enlarged, is considered a great success. There is a great advantage in being able to make jam from fruit freshly picked, and not 'smashed' by conveyance for long distances by road or rail.

At a time when great efforts are being made to place allotments and small holdings in the hands of working men, we must not neglect to notice the success of small fruit-growers in Kent, and some other counties. Many of them have risen from the position of farm labourers, and in not a few instances they have saved enough money to take a considerable acreage of land. There is no doubt as to fruit and vegetable growing being peculiarly suited to small cultivators, not only because of the superior profit of garden farming to ordinary farming, but also because the former especially needs, and pays for, minute personal attention, and affords opportunities for utilizing the labour of

of women and children, as well as of men. The admirable little book, written by the Rev. William Lea, on 'Small Farms, How they can be made to Answer by means of Fruit Growing,' should be in the hands of every peasant farmer.

During the last twenty years the demand for ornamental trees, shrubs, and flowers, has increased greatly in this country. Prices have been much reduced; but growers probably do as well at current prices with operations on a wholesale scale, as their predecessors did when there was comparatively little business done, and charges were high. The distribution of nurseries throughout the country has already been referred to. Flowers, for cutting and for re-planting alike, are grown most extensively round London and other large towns, as a matter of course, and for the most part under glass, though hardy varieties are being produced in increasing quantities out of doors. For example, Mr. John Wood, of Swanley, Kent, has devoted a considerable acreage of his farm to the cultivation of flowers for cutting, and a few other farmers have also adopted the plan. Wallflowers and violets are raised on an extensive scale at Isleworth and Twickenham, large quantities of the latter, however, being imported from the South of France and Italy. White lilac, too, is extensively imported from France, as are also yellow and white roses, evergreen ferns, a few lilies of the valley, and some varieties of the narcissus. There are foreign cut flowers of several other sorts in the market, including the mignonette, mimosa, and the daffodil; but the bulk of the supply of the last-named, as well as of roses, geraniums, fuchsias, camellias, gardenias, and hothouse flowers generally, is of home growth.

By far the most extensive trade in cut flowers of foreign origin is that done in hyacinths, tulips, and the several varieties of the narcissus, which have of late been sent in crates from Holland. The more astute of Dutch growers, however, condemn the practice, on the ground that it injures their bulb trade, which is highly lucrative. By way of reprisal, florists at Isleworth, Twickenham, and a few other places, are competing very successfully with the Dutch in the production of bulbs, as well as supplying Covent Garden with increasing supplies of cut flowers, including the tulip, the narcissus, and the lily of the valley. In the Scilly Islands also bulbs are being very profitably cultivated. The trade in pot flowers, too, is considerable; and if the prices for those raised in millions are low, growers of fine new varieties are able to demand handsome remuneration.

Hop-growing has always been a speculative business; but of late



late the range of prices has been from very low to only moderate rates, instead of from low to high, as formerly. The fall in values, however, is not to be attributed to foreign competition, which has been decreasing, rather than increasing, during the last ten years. Our net imports during each of the last two years have amounted to about 133,000 cwt., which is below the average imports of the ten previous years. The home produce was estimated by the Agricultural Department at 776,144 cwt. in 1886, and at 457,515 cwt. in 1887. As there are no official records of the average prices of English hops, the fall in value may be most accurately measured by the declared values of imports, bearing in mind the fact, that foreign hops are cheaper than English. In 1877 the average value of the imports was nearly 7*l.* per cwt., and, five years later, in 1882, it was nearly 9*l.*; whereas for the last three years the averages have been only 3*l.* 15*s.* for 1885, 2*l.* 18*s.* for 1886, and not quite 3*l.* for 1887. A table compiled from their books by Messrs. W. H. and H. Le May, hop-factors, of the Borough, London, shows the following fluctuations during the last ten years:—

|         |         | £  | s.  | £  | s. |   |         | £       | s. | £  | s.     |
|---------|---------|----|-----|----|----|---|---------|---------|----|----|--------|
| 1878-79 | October | 1  | 0   | to | 4  | 0 | 1883-84 | October | 4  | 4  | to 9 0 |
|         | March   | 1  | 5   | "  | 3  | 0 |         | March   | 5  | 5  | " 8 8  |
| 1879-80 | October | 3  | 0   | "  | 10 | 0 | 1884-85 | October | 5  | 0  | " 7 10 |
|         | March   | 3  | 0   | "  | 8  | 0 |         | March   | 2  | 10 | " 4 7  |
| 1880-81 | October | 1  | 0   | "  | 8  | 0 | 1885-86 | October | 2  | 0  | " 5 0  |
|         | March   | 4  | 0   | "  | 6  | 0 |         | March   | 1  | 0  | " 3 15 |
| 1881-82 | October | 4  | 0   | "  | 7  | 0 | 1886-87 | October | 1  | 0  | " 5 0  |
|         | March   | 4  | 0   | "  | 5  | 0 |         | March   | 1  | 0  | " 2 16 |
| 1882-83 | October | 10 | 0   | "  | 20 | 0 | 1887-88 | October | 1  | 5  | " 7 0  |
|         | March   | .. | £17 | 10 |    |   |         | March   | 1  | 0  | " 5 0  |

These two months are taken because the heaviest sales take place in October, and, if there is much doing in the following spring, it is usually in March. The extensive use of substitutes for hop in brewing appears to be the principal cause of the fall.

We have alluded more than once to complaints of preference railway rates in favour of foreign producers of fruit and vegetables; and the similar preference in connection with hops is quite as commonly complained of. Many striking instances have been published from time to time, and we might draw up a formidable list if space were available. It is to be hoped, however, that Parliament will before long put an end to this great abuse, if, indeed, it is not done before this article is published. Free competition with a world of producers, many of whom have great advantages in respect of climate, is a strain quite

quite severe enough to our garden farmers, without the injustice of a virtual bounty on imports.

In the United Kingdom, the most successful garden farming, carried on as a general system over an extensive area, is that of the Channel Islands. Partly through advantage of climate and soil, but quite as much through untiring industry and discriminating enterprise, the small farmers of those islands have, for many years, been supplying our markets with increasing quantities of early vegetables and fruits. In a series of articles which appeared in the 'Field,' the late Mr. John Coleman, Agricultural Editor of that journal, who visited the islands in 1886, gave an excellent description of their soil, land tenure, and systems of cultivation; and, by means of investigations made recently in Jersey and Guernsey, we are able to confirm most of his statements. Indeed, without a visit to the scene of their untiring labour, it is impossible to gain a fair conception of the excellent use which the Channel Islanders make of their land and their opportunities. Depression has been felt by them, it is true, but only to the extent of a diminution of great prosperity, which is almost entirely owing to the fall in the value of cattle and the failure of two banks, and has little, if anything, to do with garden farming. It is also true, that the enormous prices which the pioneers in the supply of early produce obtained some years ago, remain only as memories; but where one man obtained handsome returns from Covent Garden twenty years ago, there are now ten or more receiving thence much larger sums, and fair, though not such extravagant profits.

Jersey is credited, in the Agricultural Returns, with a cultivated area of 20,561 out of a total area of 28,717 acres; but an explanatory note intimates, that some of the land is returned twice, where two crops are grown on it in the same year. According to a return showing the acreage of land occupied by owners and tenants respectively, there are 19,626 acres of agricultural land in Jersey; and, as the number of returns from occupiers given in the Parish Returns for the Island in 1887 was 2646, the average area per holding appears to be within a small fraction of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  acres. A farm of 50 *vergées*, or about 22 acres, is reckoned a very large one in Jersey, and numbers of families are brought up in tolerable comfort on five acres, although rents are extremely high; little land is let at less than 7*l.* an acre, while for some the rent is 15*l.*, from 9*l.* to 10*l.* being most common. The secret of the possibility of paying such rents, and yet living, is the great remunerativeness of the potato crop.

Last year potatoes were grown on 6488 acres of land in  
Vol. 166.—No. 332. 2 F Jersey,

Jersey, or nearly one-third of the cultivated area. The exports amounted to 50,670 tons, valued at 434,917*l.* Here then was an average return per acre of over 67*l.*; but from this amount there are heavy expenses of freight and commission to deduct. On the other hand, it is estimated that the growers produced about 8000 tons more than they exported, some being consumed in the island, and some kept for seed. What are termed 'old' potatoes are not grown in Jersey; but all the tubers are sold as 'new,' in order that the land may be cleared for a crop of roots to follow the potatoes in the same season. The cost of growing a good crop of potatoes, according to Mr. Le Gros, a retired Jersey farmer of great experience, is about 45*l.*; rent and seed each being put at 9*l.*, and manure at no less than 18*l.* (9*l.* for stable manure and the same amount for guano or artificial manure). There is, of course, a great difference in the prices of the early and the comparatively late potatoes. For example, the weekly returns of exports collected last year by Mr. Barbier, of St. Heliers, gives 22*l.* 10*s.* per ton as the price for the week ending May 28th, and 5*l.* 12*s.* 7*d.* as that for the week ending July 16th. The high-priced potatoes are sold in small lots, and not by the ton, many of them being raised in cool houses under glass, while a few are forced with artificial heat. In an early season out-door potatoes grown on 'côtés' (hill sides facing the south or partly south) at L'Etacq, which is the most forward district in Jersey (St. Clement's coming close to it), have been raised as soon as the 27th of April; but this is rare, the first or second week in May being a more common period for the start. The yield of the very early tubers is not as great as that of those left longer in the ground; but some growers last year made as much as 1*l.* per Jersey perch, or 90*l.* an acre off 'côtés.' Mr. John Gaunt, of St. Saviour's, indeed, has sold a crop from one 'côté' for almost that sum per acre on an average for the last three years. Such great crops as 10 cabots per Jersey perch, or over 17 tons per acre, are talked of as having been occasionally grown; but so heavy a yield of new potatoes is very seldom obtained, half the quantity being considered a fair crop. Many years ago extravagant prices were realized for small quantities of very early potatoes grown in the open ground, as much as 25*s.* per cabot, or 65*l.* per ton. Such prices are now to be obtained only for potatoes grown under glass; but, except in 1886, a year of great crops and very low prices, the returns of the potato crop have been highly satisfactory to growers, and it is not surprising that its cultivation has increased. In 1867, Jersey produced only 2062 acres of potatoes; ten years later the area had increased to 4006 acres; and

and in 1887 it was 6488 acres. Soil and climate are well suited to the raising of early potatoes, and the slope of the island, rising from the south, is a great advantage. Then there is the great wealth of seaweed, free to the farmers for the trouble of getting it, and invaluable as a source of the potash which the potato feeds on. Rents have been forced up in an excessive degree by the competition of the French labourers, who come over first to work for the Jerseymen, and, having saved a little money, become their rivals in the demand for land. We regret to hear that the sons of Jersey farmers, as a rule, are leaving the farms to go into shops and offices, or to emigrate, leaving the land to be occupied more and more by Frenchmen. According to the return previously referred to, 10,119 acres of the cultivated land are occupied by the owners, and 9507 acres are let to tenants; but the temptation of high rents is yearly diminishing the number of occupying owners.

We have already given the acreage of orchards, market-gardens, and nurseries, in the island. The apple orchards have of late been greatly neglected, and are gradually disappearing. The varieties of apples grown are chiefly those used for cider. A considerable quantity of choice pears is still produced for export; but some of the growers are doing away with the trees, to cover their land with glass. The cultivation of tomatoes and grapes in Jersey is chiefly in the hands of a few extensive growers, some of whom are yearly extending their glass structures. The small farmers do not, as in Guernsey, grow fruit and vegetables under glass. The most extensive owner of glass houses in Jersey is Mr. George Bashford, of St. Saviour's, who has now about 12 acres occupied with glass houses and the necessary roadways, and expects to have his whole garden of 13 acres thus utilized before the end of next year. The remarkable success of this enterprising garden-farmer, who entered into the business, which has grown so rapidly under his management, without any previous training as a gardener, is one of the wonders of the Channel Islands. Better management is probably nowhere to be found than Mr. Bashford's, and a brief description of his crops will serve as an illustration of those grown under glass in both islands. He has a great quantity of potatoes in his houses, with tomatoes planted between the rows, some being artificially heated, and others not. Mr. Bashford does not force his potatoes, however, but plants those in hot-houses a month later than those in cool houses, so that all come to be raised at about the same time; his opinion being that forcing potatoes is not sufficiently remunerative. Last year the

average price he obtained for his tubers was  $7\frac{1}{4}d.$  per pound, and he commonly produces as much as 11 tons to the acre, and has grown at the rate of nearly 20 tons. In 1873, he sold potatoes at  $2s. 3d.$  per pound, but does not expect to realize such a price again. The price last year was  $7d.$  to  $9d.$

French beans are grown in hothouses between rows of tomatoes, to be picked in January and February, when they sell at  $2s.$  to  $2s. 3d.$  per pound. Some years ago the price was no less than  $6s.$  per pound. Peas are produced in cool houses only, picking being begun early in April, when the price is  $1s. 6d.$  per pound. Cucumbers also are grown, to be succeeded by tomatoes for winter use.

Mr. Bashford has sent 80 tons of tomatoes to London in a year, and now that he has increased his area of land under glass, he expects to grow 120 tons per annum in a favourable season. His average price last year was  $6\frac{3}{4}d.$  per pound. Tomatoes, with or without French beans or potatoes, are produced in the same houses as grapes, until the vines cover the glass, after which the shading would be too much for tomatoes, though early potatoes can be raised and matured before the leaves of late grapes cover the glass. In the middle of March, even in this late season, Mr. Bashford had begun to pick fruit from his earliest tomatoes, some of which were five feet high. The bulk of those in heat are ready by the end of March, and those in cool houses come for picking by the end of June and in the following months to the end of autumn.

Last year, Mr. Bashford sent 25 tons of grapes to London. He has two houses with double walls lined, as are the roofs and floors also, with sawdust, to keep out frost, in which he can store 12,000 bunches of grapes, the stems being inserted in bottles of water. The fruit is thus stored in the middle of December, and kept for a month or two until the price is high.

If Jersey is the Island of Potatoes, Guernsey may fairly be termed the Island of Glass. In or near St. Peter's Port there are several extensive establishments similar to that just described, though none at present as large, in which grapes, melons, tomatoes, and early vegetables, are produced. But what is more remarkable is the great number of glass houses on the small farms, and even in the cottagers' gardens. Nearly all of these are cool houses, in which late grapes, tomatoes, peas, and potatoes, are produced, forcing being, as a rule, only practised by the extensive growers, and in gentlemen's hothouses. Flowers and salad, too, are cultivated for export by market gardeners, and broccoli by the farmers. At the recent annual meeting

meeting of the Guernsey Chamber of Commerce, the exports for the past year were given as below :—

|                          | Packages. | Price.       | Value.   |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|
|                          |           | <i>s. d.</i> | <i>£</i> |
| Radishes and Broccoli .. | 37,000    | 5 0          | 9,250    |
| Grapes .. ..             | 75,000    | 10 0         | 37,500   |
| Tomatoes .. ..           | 92,000    | 6 8          | 30,600   |
| Flowers .. ..            | 23,000    | 2 6          | 3,000    |
| Potatoes .. ..           | 50,000    | 8 0          | 20,000   |
| Mushrooms .. ..          | 400       | 10 0         | 200      |
| Total .. ..              | 277,400   | ..           | 100,550  |

The increase over the exports of 1886 is 37,100 packages, and the total number has nearly doubled since 1883. The weight of the grapes is estimated at 502 tons, and that of the tomatoes at 1000 tons. Large as these exports are for an island as small as Guernsey, they cannot be complete, because there is no mention of peas, beans, melons, or other fruit than grapes and tomatoes.

Guernsey is not so well fitted as Jersey for the growth of early vegetables out of doors, chiefly because the slope of the former island faces the north instead of the south, and frost is more common. It is not surprising, then, to see that the cultivation of potatoes in Guernsey has declined, or that rents are much lower there than in Jersey. The total area of land occupied in 1887 in Guernsey and the smaller islands is returned at 11,773 acres, only 877 acres of which are under potatoes, as compared with 1044 acres in 1877. Rents range from as low as 3*l.* to nearly 10*l.* an acre, but the most common sum appears to be 6*l.* to 7*l.*, or about 3*l.* less than in Jersey.

An excellent instance of enterprise on the part of a Guernsey farmer is to be seen in the case of Mr. Le Pelly, who farms about 35 acres of land. He grows potatoes, broccoli, and other vegetables for export, and this year he has sold the crop of broccoli as it stands at 36*l.* an acre. Last year he erected an excellent glass house, 100 feet by 36 feet, at a cost of 230*l.*, and grew in it over 2½ tons of tomatoes, sold at 74*l.*, which was a pretty good return for the first year on his investment. As an instance of a greater money return than that obtained for broccoli by Mr. Le Pelly, we may state, that the price for tomatoes in the middle of March was 1½*d.* each in London, or 1*d.* clear of expenses of carriage and sale. As nearly 10,000 broccoli are grown on an acre, the net value of the crop is over 40*l.* an acre, which was realized on one farm visited last March ; and  
these

these vegetables are off the land in time for another crop of some kind to be grown this year.

According to the return previously alluded to, out of 11,773 acres of cultivated land in Guernsey and the smaller islands, 6601 acres are occupied by the owners. The average size of a holding, according to the return, is slightly over  $4\frac{2}{3}$  acres, or smaller even than in Jersey. Very few Frenchmen are to be found in Guernsey, and the competition for land is therefore less severe than in the sister island. In the one island, as in the other, however, we were assured that farmers could not make their land pay except by working hard themselves with the few labourers, if any, whom they employ.

The late winter has been disastrous to the garden-farmers of Jersey and Guernsey alike. Instead of being able to plant their potatoes in February as usual, they had not finished by the end, or nearly the end, of March. Potatoes and other produce in cool houses, too, were cut off by the severe frosts of February, and again in March. Such a season is almost unprecedented in their islands.

Although we are far from underrating the natural advantages enjoyed by garden-farmers in the Channel Islands, we cannot fail to see, that there is a great deal in their practice which might be extensively imitated in the United Kingdom. Early potatoes, with other green crops to follow in the same season, might be grown in the South of Ireland, and in some parts of the South of England, to a greater extent than at present, and almost if not quite as advantageously as in Jersey; while a few enterprising Englishmen have already proved, that the extensive use of glass in the growth of certain kinds of produce can be as successfully practised here as in Guernsey. No doubt it would be easy to overdo this description of enterprise; but it will be time enough to think of that when something more than a beginning has been made.

---



ART. VI. — *Histoire de la Monarchie de Juillet*. Par Paul Thureau-Dangin. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Grand Prix Gobert. Paris, 1885 et 1886. 4 vols.

THE four volumes, in which this history of the French Monarchy of July is brought down from July 1830 to July 1841, contain an accumulation of information on the subject of this reign. The author has spared himself no labour in the accomplishment of his task. Not only has he taken advantage of the many memoirs of this epoch, which have been published in France by the statesmen who themselves were the principal politicians of that day, but he has apparently faced the alarming task of reading the back files of the chief newspapers in circulation throughout these eleven years. At least so it would appear from the numerous quotations taken from them. Moreover much hitherto unpublished material has been at his disposal, including correspondence in the possession of the Duc de Broglie, journals of the royal family, state papers, and memoirs of M. de Saint-Aulaire. In dealing with the foreign policy of France under Louis Philippe, M. Thureau-Dangin has made use of the memoirs of M. de Metternich, the 'Greville Memoirs,' Bulwer's 'Life of Lord Palmerston,' &c. In short, he has neglected nothing which could assist him in the accomplishment of his work. The prevailing characteristic of the book, and at the same time its chief merit and its chief fault, is its completeness.

It is so full in its detail that the student will find there, either in extenso or by reference, almost all the material at present available which bears upon this reign. There is a multitude of references in the footnotes, and the quotations are nearly as numerous. To this, so long as these quotations do not exceed a limit of a few lines, no objection can be taken; but for the ordinary reader, who does not contemplate writing a book himself, it is somewhat trying to find whole pages of the speeches of M. Thiers and of M. Guizot incorporated in these volumes.

It is particularly strange to have to make this criticism on a French historian, but the truth is, that the style of his work is not French. The justification of this paradox is the fact, that the sentences are long, not short, while there is scarcely an antithesis to be found in the whole work. In one French speciality, however, M. Thureau-Dangin excels; no event is ever referred to except by the most useless half of its date. From 1830 to 1841, for instance, the various French ministries succeeded each other with a rapidity only exceeded by that of the French ministerial changes

changes of the last ten years. The English reader yearns accordingly for the names of the prime ministers or the associations of great events as his *memoria technica*. Alas! for him, he never receives anything but dates, dates of the months without the years. The cabinet of the 11th of October; the policy of the 13th of March; a minister of the 6th of September; a deputy who has formed part of the government, or of the opposition of the 12th of May, or the 13th of February, or the 15th of April; these are references which carry with them bewilderment and despair. Yet they cross and recross each other in never ending procession, and the only way to follow them is to have a private list, affixing to each day of the month the year which happens to belong to it. Mark Twain's French sermon on Adam, the Fall, and the expulsion from the Garden of Eden—'My hearers, we have sad cause to remember the man of the 13th of January. The results of the vast crime of the 13th of January have been in just proportion to the magnitude of the act itself: but for it there had been no 30th of November'—is no skit at all. It is an exact reproduction.

If the historian has not succeeded in making his work concise, he has certainly contrived to exhibit an unusual amount of impartiality. It is evidently one of the objects he has aimed at, and he has succeeded admirably. An Orleanist himself, he does not conceal the weaknesses and errors of Louis Philippe. Extremely anti-republican, he gives credit for sincerity and patriotism to those whose political action he wholly condemns. A great admirer of parliamentary government, he makes no effort to conceal the glaring evils of which it may be the cause. Although, like every Frenchman, intensely patriotic, there is no Chauvinism in his opinions, and he makes allowance for the susceptibilities, as well as for the just claims, of other nations.

This reign belongs to that stage of history, which is nearly 'terra incognita' to a vast number of those educated Englishmen who happen to be under fifty years of age. The events happened before their own political recollections begin, but after the period dealt with in their school and University textbooks. Except, in a fragmentary manner, from recently published memoirs, no opportunity has existed for them to learn the history of the period to which the monarchy of July belongs. To many such, therefore, these volumes will have a peculiar interest. For those countries especially which enjoy the unmitigated blessings of parliamentary government, even a brief outline of the general history of the reign brings into prominence events carrying with them certain salutary lessons.

On the evening of the 29th of July, 1830, the battle was over  
in

in the streets of Paris. The forces of Charles X. were defeated; the forces of the liberal opposition, the mob in the streets, that Frankenstein which they had conjured up, that spectre which had been laid ever since the days of Prairial, were everywhere victorious. What were the victors to do with their victory? The majority of the late opposition in the Chamber, the famous 221 deputies, were disposed to make terms with the King, who was understood to be ready to concede all the points lately in dispute. No decision had, however, been come to among the politicians, when M. Thiers, then a young journalist, threw out the suggestion of offering the crown to Louis Philippe, Duc d'Orléans, a suggestion quickly welcomed, and finally agreed to almost unanimously by this section of the victorious party. But in this drama the part of Hamlet did not belong to the parliamentary opposition. It belonged to their masters, the revolutionary insurgents installed at the Hôtel de Ville, where the aged La Fayette, really the tool of his followers, imagined himself once more the leader of the men of 1789.

To have dethroned Charles X. only for the purpose of enthroning Louis Philippe was far from being the object in view at the Hôtel de Ville. The proposal, therefore, of the parliamentary leaders at the Palais Bourbon was there received with an outburst of contemptuous fury. How was this opposition to be overcome? Fortunately for the Duc d'Orléans, La Fayette had promised a guarded support to his candidature, and relying on this the supporters of the Duke determined to try a bold stroke. At two o'clock, on the afternoon of July 31, a strange procession issued from the gates of the Palais Royal. First came a lame drummer beating a salute on a cracked drum, followed by the officers of the Chamber clothed in black. Behind them rode the Duc d'Orléans on a white charger, wearing the uniform of a general officer, and attended by one aide-de-camp. In his hat he carried an immense tricolour bow. Next in order straggled about eighty deputies in travelling dress, headed by M. Laffitte carried in a chair by two porters. The cortège was wound up by Benjamin Constant, who from his infirmities had also to be carried in a sedan chair. With difficulty this singular procession makes its way, through the vast crowds which fill the streets, till it reaches the Hôtel de Ville. Vainly does the Prince coquette with the crowd by shaking hands with all who offer him theirs. All around is a sea of sinister-looking countenances. Almost the only cry he hears is 'Plus de Bourbons!' At the Hôtel de Ville the reception is, if possible, still more chilling, and the deputies feel doubtful whether the event may not prove serious,  
when

when the Duc d'Orléans and La Fayette by a sudden action seize a tricolour flag, link their arms, and rush to open the open windows. The fickle crowd, moved by a sudden impulse, rend the air with enthusiastic shouts of 'Vive la Fayette! Vive le duc d'Orléans.' The day is won for the Duke, and his return to the Palais Royal is a triumphal progress.

In this way France received a new dynasty at the hands of a small minority of the inhabitants of her capital. The enormous majority of the nation were not consulted, and had no voice whatever in the change. As became a monarchy, whose cradle had been the Hôtel de Ville, the first ministry, although it at first contained some Conservative elements, was an extremely radical one. M. Laffitte, the popular but foolish banker, was President of the Council, with M. Dupont de l'Eure as Minister of the Interior. In addition to this, M. Odilon Barrot was Prefect of the Seine, while La Fayette had the supreme command of the National Guard.

In sketching in outline the events of this reign, questions of foreign policy can be dealt with more satisfactorily if taken by themselves, more especially as the interior history naturally groups itself into four distinct periods. The first of these is the ministry of M. Laffitte, which lasted from August 1830 till the advent of M. Casimir Périer in March 1831. One word alone can describe this period, Anarchy—Anarchy complete and unchecked—Anarchy installed in power. The King was timid; the Chambers timid and puzzled; the ministry partly frightened, partly under the sway of revolutionary theories, wholly stupid and devoid of the least conception of the duties of a government. Whatever La Fayette advised, that the ministry assented to, their adviser being himself only the mouthpiece of the revolutionary leaders at the Hôtel de Ville, themselves in turn the obedient servants of King Mob. The army was under a cloud. The National Guard, on whom the duty of preserving order devolved throughout this reign, but particularly in its early days, were hardly a degree better than the mob. They fraternized with it oftener than they controlled its furies. It was indeed the question, 'quis custodiet ipsos custodes?'

Disorder was chronic; émeutes of constant occurrence. The only attempt which was made to control the mob was by means of proclamations and by inspired articles in the press, of which the following are a few samples. An atrocious uprising having for its object the murder of the late ministers of Charles X. was, in the revolutionary jargon of the time, merely a 'malentendu'

in the 'indu' arising from the 'émotion populaire,' and resulting in a 'démarche inopportune' on the part of the 'hommes de Paris, race de braves, peuple d'élite, fait pour la gloire, pour les nobles élans de cœur.' Such a state of things could have only disastrous results. Trade was paralysed; a great number of bankruptcies ensued; distress, uneasiness, and misery, prevailed on every side. Welcome, therefore, was the day when the culminating point, which wrought the proverbial cure, was at last reached in the sack of the church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois and of the Archbishop's palace; when the prelate's magnificent library was wholly destroyed, part being burnt and part thrown into the Seine. M. Thureau-Dangin pauses in his history to give a detailed account of the social state of France at this time. The picture he draws is a gloomy one.

An almost universal scepticism in religious belief prevailed. Bishops and priests dared not show themselves in public, in their distinctive dress. The theatres vied with the pamphleteers in pouring contempt upon religion. As a trait of the time, we are told that a M. Dubois, Inspector-General of the University, when visiting the College of Rennes in his official capacity, made in his address the following remarks (among others) about Catholicism, 'Messieurs, nous marchons vers une grande époque et peut-être assisterons-nous aux funérailles d'un grand culte.' Nor was the tone different among the brilliant school of writers which belongs to this period, many of whom, carried away by the passing revolutionary fever, were distracted from their books to politics, and felt themselves capable of any height of statesmanship. Victor Hugo, A. Dumas, Balzac, followed also by Georges Sand, produced a mass of literature, full of genius indeed, but of genius perverted to the service of atheism and revolution, mixed with an impure realism.

This literature, at first full of the hope of revolutionary visions, could not survive the deadening influence of realities as they developed themselves; and while the evil matter remained behind, the hope which had coloured it fled, and was succeeded by a general hopeless scepticism, the embodiment of which was to be seen in the applause evoked by Frédéric Lemaître in his rendering of the part of Robert Macaire.

The second period begins with the fall of M. Laffitte, in March 1831; when, anarchy having become insupportable in Paris, the bourgeoisie grew clamorous for the restoration of order; and Louis Philippe at length took courage and dismissed his ministers. With the advent to power of M. Casimir Périer on the 31st of March, began a new policy of resistance to the forces of disorder. This policy was continued by the two cabinets,

cabinets, which succeeded in turn to that of M. Périer; different cabinets in name, but in their composition inspired by the same leading men. MM. Guizot and Thiers were the chief lieutenants of M. Périer; and when, after his death from cholera in 1832, the cabinet was reconstituted under the presidency of Marshal Soult, they still retained their portfolios. They did not relinquish office on the ministry being once again constructed in 1835, with the Duc de Broglie as its chief; who had indeed himself been already Minister of Foreign Affairs under Marshal Soult. The policy of resistance may therefore be said to have been uninterruptedly followed, from March 1831, till the fall of the De Broglie ministry, on the 4th of February 1836.

It is not to be wondered at that, after having been unmolested in their courses for nearly a year, the party of disorder fought hard against the Conservative policy of M. Périer and his successors. As a matter of fact, nothing could exceed the intensity of their bitterness, or the extent of their audacity at the commencement of this struggle. It was not as if the Government had only to deal with the revolutionists of the streets. That would have been a comparatively easy matter. But their task was rendered doubly hard by the flank attacks to which they were exposed from the allies of their enemy. The men of the street were openly countenanced by the republican party, which first avowed itself under that name (then still odious in France from the recollections of the Terror), in 1831-2. Among the republican leaders were a young enthusiast, Godefroy Cavaignac, and Armand Carrel, the principal editor of the 'National.' Republicanism under the Monarchy of July was also tinged with Bonapartism, and extended its sympathies to the traditions of Imperialism.

Behind the avowedly republican party, which had at that time but few representatives in the Chamber of Deputies, stood the professedly dynastic and monarchical left, which performed for them the friendly office of the boy who inserts a stick between the legs of a policeman in pursuit of a thief; while in close partnership with the left, in every endeavour to impede the Government in the execution of its duty, was the small band of legitimists, who, at first under Chateaubriand and then under Berryer, had vowed implacable hostility to the Bourgeois King. Nor did the parliamentary difficulties end here, for out of the ranks of the Conservative majority themselves arose, after the death of Casimir Périer, a party, self-styled 'le tiers-parti,' which piqued itself on being more moderate and conciliatory than its friends, and which in 1834 showed its independence

by

by putting the Soult ministry in a minority. To these difficulties of the Government was added one, which greatly hampered the Executive in its struggle with disorder. The juries were not to be depended upon; they constantly acquitted the accused, in the face not only of the clearest evidence, but of their own exultant avowal.

As was inevitable with a monarchy so curiously begotten as that of Louis Philippe, the brunt of the attacks upon the Government, and the existing order of things, was directed personally against the King. In the press and in pamphlets, from the extemporized tribune in the clubs, and from the dock in the courts of law, he was denounced as an odious tyrant. Worse than that for the fortunes of his house, caricature turned her poisonous shafts against him. Never at any time has this potent weapon been used with greater persistency, or with greater effect than against this unfortunate King. '*Le Charivari*' and '*la Caricature*,' both edited by Philipon, led the way, and, illustrated by the lately discovered art of lithography, a flood of similar literature was poured upon France. As a result of these persistent personal attacks, it was noticed that during the émeute of the 5th of June, 1832, no cries were more frequent than those of '*Vive la république! à bas Louis Philippe!*' and a hostile attempt on the King's life by Fieschi, the first of a series, on the 28th of July, 1835, was only the natural outcome of these prolonged attacks against him from the platform or in the press.

The general character of the revolutionary movement has been described. It only remains to mention the attempts, which it made within this period, to wrest the sceptre by main force from the hands of the King. Three times France saw the barricades rise,—in Paris, on the 5th of June, 1832, and the 13th of April, 1834; in Lyons, on the 9th of April that same year. On each occasion a battle was fought in the streets, with a roll of dead and wounded in 1832 of over 800 persons. In 1834, both at Lyons and in Paris, the insurrection was the work of a revolutionary society, called '*La Société des Droits de l'Homme*,' and what is worthy of note is that this Society, for the first time, combined with the creed of Republicanism that Communism which is now the chief glory of the electors of Paris. In these years the policy of resistance was carried on with great determination. Not only did the Government use all the powers which the law gave it; not only did it meet the émeutes with the only language intelligible to the men, who took part in them, the language of shot and shell in place of the proclamations of M. Odilon Barrot; but it also applied  
to



to the Chambers for fresh powers, and obtained them in the teeth of a violent parliamentary opposition. In 1834, a law was made, by which any association of more than twenty persons was, unless authorized by the Government, declared illegal. And, besides, there were the famous September laws against the revolutionists and the revolutionary press. What was the result of these six years of firm government? We will give them in the words of the historian:—

‘The revolution kept within bounds, the émeutes crushed, the clubs shut up, the secret societies dissolved, the license of the press curbed, security re-established; the Government has reconquered its material supremacy, and a portion of its moral authority; the public credit is restored, commerce and manufactures enjoy an unprecedented prosperity; religion even once more enjoys a popularity unknown for many years under the conditions of modern society.’

The third period, from February 1836 to October 1840, is dominated by the personality of M. Thiers. It begins with his first and ends with his second ministry, and in the intervening years it is M. Thiers who is the moving spirit of the opposition. His first ministry lasted from February 22 to September 3, 1836; his second from March 1 to October 26, 1840; and it is quite remarkable how similar are the characteristics of both, though separated by a distance of five years. Each ministry lasted but a few months; during each the minister endeavoured to obtain his parliamentary majority from both sides of the Chamber; on each occasion M. Thiers quarrelled with the King, and was dismissed from office on a question of foreign policy; in 1836 because he rashly desired to intervene in Spain, in 1840 because he was drawing France into a war with Europe on behalf of Mehemet Ali. On the internal policy of M. Thiers our historian is especially severe. He calls it ‘la politique de bascule,’ and pours the vials of his sarcastic wrath on the speeches, by which the subtle minister endeavoured to ‘ménager’ in turn the right and the left of the Chamber. At the beginning of his speeches, he would turn towards the right, and announce his determination to continue the policy of resistance; at the end of his speech, he would endeavour to gain the applause of the left, by talking about conciliation and by glorying in being himself a child of the revolution.

In September, 1836, the Thiers’ ministry was succeeded by a cabinet under the presidency of M. Molé, who now added, to his experiences, as a minister of the Empire and of the Restoration, those of a minister of the monarchy of July. This cabinet at first comprised M. Guizot, but on that statesman ascertaining that the President of the Council did not hold the same  
views

views as himself as to the necessity for continuing the policy of resistance, he retired, and the Molé cabinet was reconstituted without him. M. Molé held office till the spring of 1839. His ideas of government seem, in some respects, to have been not unlike those of M. Thiers, and tact and contrivance were made to do duty for statesmanship. In justice to these ministers it must however be remembered, with what an exceedingly difficult chamber they had to deal, split up into right, centre, and left, each of these divisions in turn being subdivided into groups to such an extent, that M. Thureau-Dangin applies to the condition of things the words '*l'émiettement de la Chambre.*' Under these circumstances, and as it was impossible to guess how any group would vote on any particular question, ministers had to beg, borrow, or steal a majority (generally a different one on each vote) as best they could.

The two incidents for which M. Molé's ministry is memorable are the marriage of the Duc d'Orléans with the Princess Helen of Mecklenburg, the Duc being the first heir to the French throne that had married a Protestant; and the amnesty to all political offenders which was proclaimed on the occasion. Of this marriage was born the present Comte de Paris. The main characteristic of M. Molé's ministries was, however, the predominance of the Crown. Louis Philippe was a man of the world, and understood foreign politics. His opinion accordingly had gone for a great deal, in determining the foreign policy of all his ministries; but over M. Molé and his colleagues he had such an influence, that the foreign policy was really his own policy, and the whole government was to a great extent the personal government of the King. This was certainly no misfortune for France, for the King's policy was cautious and moderate, and perhaps no evil would have ensued, if the King could only have held his tongue. But Louis Philippe was just like an old hen. It was no pleasure to him to have laid an egg unless all the world knew it. He was perpetually cackling to ambassadors, journalists, deputies, and men of business, of what *he* would or would not allow to be done, of *his* policy, of *his* this and *his* that, till at last he succeeded in making the constitutional fiction, that the King's ministers were responsible for every act of policy, too absurd for French logic to submit to. The consequence was that, in the bitter struggle between the Molé ministry and the famous coalition of the opposition, the King in person was openly attacked in the press, and even from the tribune; nor is it easy to see, what other result could have followed, from the Bourgeois King giving himself the airs of a Louis XIV.

In

In consequence of checks received in the Chamber, on some proposed modifications of the jury laws, M. Molé hesitated to apply the policy of resistance with such determination as M. Guizot thought necessary. The leader in the parliamentary opposition which had occasioned those checks had been M. Thiers; and after the withdrawal of M. Guizot from the cabinet, the opposition of M. Thiers remained unabated. In the Chamber the opponents of the Government consisted, roughly, of three parties—some of the ‘Centre Droit’ and the doctrinaires, led by M. Guizot; the ‘Centre Gauche,’ led by M. Thiers; and the ‘Gauche,’ led by M. Odilon Barrot. These three parties had little in common, except their hostility to M. Molé and to his ministry; but that hostility was sufficient. They formed the famous coalition of opposition; a coalition of journals, and a coalition of votes. The dishonesty of such a coalition is apparent, when we remember the gulf which divided M. Guizot from M. Odilon Barrot in their ideas of the true principles of Government, and when we bear in mind, that M. Guizot’s confidence in M. Thiers had been destroyed by the movement of the latter towards the left, and away from the old policy of resistance. M. Thiers was the life and soul of this coalition. The Government was pressed in debate after debate, and division after division; but M. Molé, backed by his 221 supporters, just held the field by small majorities. In an evil moment for his ministry he had recourse to a dissolution (the second within a few months), and failed. The coalition had triumphed. Splendid indeed were the fruits they reaped. Splendid for the men of the left. They had this time succeeded in making all government impossible, which is apparently the ideal of the extreme left of all French Chambers. For two months no ministry could be formed. Neither party of the coalition was strong enough to stand by itself; M. Odilon Barrot and M. Thiers agreed only in one thing, to exclude M. Guizot. How matters would have ended, it is impossible to say; but on the 12th of May, 1839, an émeute broke out in Paris. Under the impulse of the salutary dread thus occasioned, the King succeeded in extemporizing a ministry that same evening, composed partly of the Centre Droit, and partly of the Centre Gauche, but from which M. Thiers and M. Guizot were alike excluded. From the point of view, however, of M. Guizot and the doctrinaires, the fruits of the coalition could not have seemed quite so splendid. Their excuse for the coalition, as urged especially by M. Duvergier de Hauranne, had been that in the Molé cabinet, the English doctrine of the constitutional King reigning but not ruling was set aside, to the great danger  
of

of the monarchy, and that, therefore, this too compliant minister must be got rid of. This they had succeeded in doing. But at what cost? no less than that of opening a fresh parallel against the fortress of monarchy itself. Up to the time of the Molé ministry the attacks against the King in person had been confined to the revolutionaries and their journals and clubs. In the campaign of the coalition, both in the debates from the tribune and in the electoral struggle afterwards, these statesmen, all calling themselves constitutionalists, themselves attacked Louis Philippe either directly or by implication. As one of them said at the time, 'Le roi est visé.' The extemporized ministry of the 12th of May, 1839, did not last long. It was turned out by the refusal of the Chamber to vote an allowance to the Duc de Nemours, the King's son, on his marriage.

The date of their fall is the date of the commencement of the second ministry of M. Thiers. It was during this second ministry that he conceived the idea of bringing back from St. Helena the body of Napoleon. In his object, which had been to court popularity, he signally failed, but what effect his action may have had on the fortunes of Napoleon III. would be a curious matter for speculation. Having now reached the end of this third period, in which M. Thiers' personality is so prominent, let us mark the reflections of our historian on the net result of the actions of that statesman up to this time:—

'And now at the moment of his quitting power, what does he leave behind him? In France, the great victory gained by Casimir Périer over anarchy, and the external peace he had secured, both once more jeopardised; public opinion feverish and unquiet; revolutionary passions in a ferment; all who have a stake in the country anxious and distressed; the finances of the nation so burthened as to render an equilibrium of the budget for several years impossible.'

The events of the fourth period, into which we have divided the internal history of the monarchy of July, begin with the advent to power of M. Guizot, the 29th of October, 1840, and end with the simultaneous fall of his ministry, and of the monarchy itself, in February, 1848. The policy of M. Guizot on taking office was, abroad to rescue France from the 'impasse' into which M. Thiers had got her on the Egyptian question, at home to resume and carry out the policy of resistance. The minister must soon have discovered the irreparable harm he had done to the Conservative cause, by the course he had adopted in joining the coalition. At no time were the attacks upon the King, in the press, more vehement or more persistent. He was accused of tyranny; he was held up to odium, as absolutely devoid of patriotism. To such lengths did these attacks go,

that a Legitimist journal, 'La France,' published three letters which Louis Philippe was stated to have written since he had become King. No dates or particulars were given, only their contents. In the first, the King promised England to evacuate Algeria; in the second, he took credit with Russia, Prussia, and Austria for having facilitated their task of crushing the Polish Insurrection; in the third, he represented the fortifications of Paris (which were begun in 1840-1), as directed against the people of Paris. These impudent forgeries were the work of a woman, formerly the mistress of Marshal Ney, and at this time living in London, who had sold them to 'La France.' An action was commenced against the editor of the journal, whose advocate at the trial pleaded neither the genuineness of the letters, nor their probability, but simply that his client had acted in good faith. The editor was acquitted!

The celebrated question of the Spanish marriages, which produced such a coolness between England and France, occupies the whole foreground of the foreign relations of France during this period. In like manner all internal questions are of small interest beside that of reform, which was pressed upon the Government with ever-increasing persistency by the opposition and their press, and which had such disastrous consequences for the Government and for the Monarchy. M. Thiers throughout this period was the most prominent, and certainly not the least bitter of the opponents of M. Guizot; but, at the same time, no large portion of the opposition ranks seem to have looked to him as their personal leader.

The revolution of July, 1830, left France in a weak condition for military operations. The army consisted of less than 300,000 men, and its prestige was diminished by the events which had recently taken place in Paris. This state of affairs constituted a serious danger for the country, for the foreign relations of France were in a delicate situation. The new monarchy was looked upon with suspicion by all the old-established dynasties of the Continent, and their ill-humour was not likely to be decreased by the events which, in different parts of Europe, followed the advent to power of Louis Philippe, events which beyond a doubt were stimulated by the example of what had taken place in Paris. We allude to the revolt of Belgium from the King of Holland, and to the revolutions which broke out in Italy against the dominion of the Pope, and in Poland against the rule of the Czar.

The first effect on the Continent was the closer knitting together of Russia, Austria, and Prussia for mutual defence. These

These Powers hoped for the closer adhesion of England to their confederacy, which would have meant the re-establishment of the Holy Alliance; and it certainly was not the fault of the revolutionary and extreme parties in France that such adhesion was not effected. A moment when all Europe was suspicious of France, and ready to see in her least actions the old spirit of the aggressive propaganda of 1793, was just the occasion for the French revolutionary party to display to an astonished world the exact measure of their statesmanship. War for the Belgians in Holland! War against the Pope, and the Austrians to boot, on behalf of the Italian insurrection! Send a French army to Poland to confront the armies of the Czar! What mattered it that that army would have to cross half Europe to reach Poland, fighting Prussia and the whole Germanic Confederation *en route*? The more tyrants to fight, the better! Let them remember '93 and tremble! The French army was small, but were there not the National Guards, the heroes of July, the paladins of the barricades? Besides, the French armies would have but to show themselves across the frontiers and the peoples would rise *en masse*, welcoming them as brothers, and of their own accord chasing their tyrants from their tottering thrones!

Such was the language of the noisy demagogues, who were at this time really directing the internal affairs of France by means of their faithful servants, MM. Laffitte and Odilon Barrot. It was the King and M. de Talleyrand, aided presently by M. Casimir Périer and his successors, who saved France from the vista of calamities opened out by the ideas of these sapient politicians. With great patience and tact these statesmen conducted the Belgian question into that channel, the famous Conference of London, whence emerged its final successful issue. With reason, Louis Philippe and his ministers prided themselves on this feat of diplomacy. While avoiding European complications, notwithstanding repeated armed interference on behalf of the Belgians against the Dutch; while convincing the Continental Courts of the disinterested moderation of France and of the good faith of the new dynasty, they had preserved the dignity and material interests of France, and once more affirmed her superior claim to a voice in the affairs of Belgium. In the conduct of these negotiations the mainstay of the policy of France was the alliance with England, which the experienced eye of M. de Talleyrand had at once seen to be essential for their purpose, and which he had himself negotiated with Lord Palmerston from the French Embassy in London. Without the co-operation of the English Government, it is not easy to see



how Louis Philippe could at the same time have made head against impracticable revolutionaries in Paris, the no less impracticable ultra-National party in Belgium, and the frigid suspicion of the Continental Powers. The alliance with England once established became the main principle of the foreign policy of the monarchy of July, until it was shaken by the Egyptian question in 1840, and practically shattered by the affair of the Spanish marriages.

It was during the Duc de Broglie's tenure of the ministry of foreign affairs, from 1832 to 1836, that both these questions rose into prominence.

The Egyptian imbroglio, which was at that time in its first stages, and did not ripen into a crisis till the ministry of M. Thiers in 1840, had its origin in a quarrel between the Sultan of Turkey and his deputy, Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt. The latter had Syria as well as Egypt in his hands, and his power was apparently at least as formidable as that of his sovereign. Accordingly fired by ambition, Mehemet Ali desired to form out of his Pashalik and the adjacent provinces a kingdom for his family; and he designed to wrest from the Sultan, against whom he was in rebellion, an hereditary investiture of Egypt and Syria in himself. The sympathies of France had always been on the side of the Pasha and against the Sultan; but in 1839 this sympathy had become, in the words of our historian, a veritable 'engouement,' in which the King, the ministers, the opposition, the Chambers, the press, and public opinion generally all shared. What the origin of this feeling was it is not easy to say. No doubt it pleased the Parisian press to describe Mehemet Ali as an offspring of the revolution of July, along with the Polish and Italian insurgents, but probably there was at the bottom a more solid foundation for this championship. The effect of this feeling on the English alliance was soon manifest. The policy of France was to help the Pasha to carve out of the Turkish Empire as large a dominion for himself as possible. The policy of the English Government, but particularly that of Lord Palmerston, was to support the Sultan, and to reduce Mehemet Ali's power to comparatively small dimensions. The ways of the two countries diverged more and more, till the treaty of July 15, 1840, came as a complete revelation to France of her isolation in Europe on this question.

The further England had diverged from France in policy, the nearer had been her approximation to the Continental Powers, especially to Russia, whose views, so far as Mehemet Ali was concerned, did not differ materially from hers. In the negotiations



ciations previous to this treaty, France had insisted on all Egypt and all Syria being reserved to the Pasha's family in hereditary succession; and the diplomatic endeavours to effect a general understanding of the five great Powers had failed before the refusal of M. Thiers to consent to anything less. The French Government and the King based their calculation on two unsound premises; the first of which was that the English Ministry would never allow Lord Palmerston to come to any agreement with the Eastern Powers to the exclusion of France. The practical effect of the treaty of July 15, the falsification of the first premiss, was that the Porte offered as terms to Mehemet Ali the confirmation of the Pashalik of Egypt to his family in hereditary succession, and that the four great Powers, who signed it, pledged themselves to support the Porte in reducing Mehemet Ali to obedience. By the actual words of the treaty, the Porte withdrew all offers from the Pasha if he did not accept his terms within twenty days; but it was generally felt that, in face of the attitude of France, this was never likely to be insisted upon to its full extent.

The excitement in France at the news of this treaty was very great. While warlike opinions were expressed on all sides, warlike preparations were vigorously commenced by the French Government. However, Louis Philippe and his ministers still relied on their second premiss. They believed that Mehemet Ali was so strong, that no display of force, such as the four signatory Powers would be willing to use, could possibly compel his submission to the Sultan. So fixed were they in this illusion, that they confidently looked to a vindication of their position, and to the discomfiture of Lord Palmerston, from the events which would follow. Never was a ministry more fully or speedily undeceived.

Lord Palmerston was not the man to let the grass grow under his feet; and no sooner was it known that Mehemet Ali refused to submit to the Porte than the British fleet, under Admiral Napier, was set in motion, and with scarcely any resistance the Pasha's strongholds on the coast fell before it. The taking of St. Jean d'Acre on November 2 was the finishing stroke. Syria was in revolt behind him, and the Pasha ordered his son Ibrahim to withdraw the Egyptian armies into Egypt. As the news from Syria came to hand, the excitement in France became greater and greater, till at last a war fever was upon the country. If M. Thiers had remained in office, France would have been plunged into a war with England, and probably with the continental Powers as well. In Germany, for instance, there was a resurrection of national feeling directed entirely against France.

That

That this danger was not chimerical, M. Thiers's frank avowals, when speaking in the Chamber as a member of the opposition, prove conclusively. Thus once more did Louis Philippe save France from what must have proved a disastrous war.

On M. Guizot's assumption of office in 1840 he determined to avoid a foolish and useless war, but at the same time he intended to obtain for the Pasha the best terms possible. With this end in view, he continued the military preparations which M. Thiers had begun, and which were in themselves essential to raise the French army to the strength considered necessary for her security. After protracted negotiations, peace was signed on the terms offered to the Pasha by the treaty of July 15, 1840. He retained Egypt in hereditary succession by primogeniture for his family, paying a tribute to the Sultan to be agreed upon between themselves. Unless he had had France as his champion, it is possible that he would not, after his collapse in Syria, have obtained such favourable terms.

The brunt of French indignation and wrath throughout the Egyptian question was levelled at Lord Palmerston, who was the embodiment and mainstay of the policy which had defeated the policy of France. That Lord Palmerston sometimes exhibited a tendency to bully, in his relations with foreign countries, may no doubt be true; but it is certain, that in all this question, whatever may have been his fault occasionally in diplomatic manners, he exhibited an astonishing firmness and penetration—penetration, in that he gauged accurately from the first the true measure of the power of Mehemet Ali, and estimated exactly what resistance to his policy the French government would be able to offer; firmness, in that he upheld his policy in the teeth of frequent wavering on the part of his continental allies (except Russia), and of open hostility to it on the part of some of his colleagues in Lord Melbourne's Cabinet, till it was triumphantly vindicated by success. As early as September 1, 1839, in writing to Sir Henry Bulwer, he announced as the ultimate goal of his policy the confining of Mehemet Ali to Egypt, while in a letter to Lord Granville, under date of November 15, 1840, he explains how important the success of his policy was to the future interests of England:—

‘Another thing has now been made plain besides the weakness of Mehemet Ali, and that is the real design of France in all these matters. Remusat has let the cat out of the bag by declaring that France, in protecting Mehemet Ali, meant to establish a new second-rate maritime power in the Mediterranean, whose fleet might unite with that of France for the purpose of serving as a counterpoise to that of England.’

A power,

A power, be it remembered, owing everything to France and commanding the direct route to India.

The second of the questions, the Spanish one, remains to be considered. Ferdinand VII., King of Spain, died in September 1833, leaving his crown to his infant daughter Isabella, under the guardianship of his widow the Queen Maria Christina. This was the signal for one of those imbroglions of civil wars, which seem to be the peculiar delight of the modern Spaniard. Don Carlos, uncle of the young Queen, was first in the field with a strong body of adherents; and as the impotence of the government to deal with him became apparent, his example was soon followed in other parts of the country by an insurrection of revolutionaries of the French type. Spain became thus plunged into all the miseries of civil war and absence of government. England and France were much interested in the concerns of the Peninsula, which both alike claimed to patronize, especially as the civil war in Spain was contemporaneous with one of a similar character in Portugal, where the throne of another young Queen, Maria, was threatened by another uncle, Don Miguel. In the earlier stages of this question, notwithstanding a certain amount of mutual jealousy, England and France were disposed to act in concert; and the Quadruple Alliance of April 22, 1834, was the result of this disposition. By it England promised, to the Portuguese and Spanish governments, her help by sea against the pretenders Don Miguel and Don Carlos; while France agreed, in case the help of her armies should be judged necessary, 'to do in this respect whatever might be agreed upon by common consent between her and her three allies.' As events in Spain developed themselves, the impression in England was, that the government of the young Queen would in the long run surmount its difficulties; but in France it was feared, that this would not be the case, unless she received some assistance from outside. Now it so happened, that it had for some time been an object of Louis Philippe's ambition to emancipate himself from the absolute necessity of holding fast to the English alliance, and with this object he had been endeavouring to bring about a 'rapprochement' between the monarchy of July and the three Eastern Powers. This object, natural in itself, he endeavoured to carry out by means not strictly customary to constitutional sovereigns. He carried on a correspondence with the foreign courts, through their ambassadors, and over the heads of his own ministers. To a certain extent he succeeded in his object. Prussia became distinctly friendly to his throne. In Austria M. de Metternich, though very cautious not to entangle his policy

policy with that of France, allowed his suspicions of such an illegitimately born monarchy to subside. The Czar alone remained obdurate in his hostility to the revolution of 1830 and to all its works. When M. Thiers became President of the Council for the first time in 1836, the King became aware that his minister entered into his views with regard to a 'rapprochement' with the continental Powers, and combined heartily with him for that object. When the ground was considered to be sufficiently prepared, M. Thiers, in spite of the misgivings of his ambassador at Vienna, tried to cement his policy by the great stroke of securing an Austrian Archduchess as a wife for the Duc d'Orléans. It was when smarting from the rebuff he met with in this matter, that the versatile M. Thiers turned his attention actively to the affairs of Spain, hoping by a successful policy there to soothe the 'amour propre' of France and his own. But it must ever remain uncertain how far he had actually framed a definite plan of action in this respect, for as soon as the King was convinced that it was really contemplated to send French armies into Spain, he nipped the policy in the bud by dismissing the minister.

According to the prognostication of the English Government, so it turned out. The government of the young Spanish Queen did succeed in triumphing over her foes without external aid. The Spanish question was destined, however, to be perennial for the monarchy of July. As time went on the point arose, who was to be the Queen of Spain's husband. An exchange of views and mutual consideration between the Cabinets of London and Paris followed. At last an understanding was arrived at. Lord Aberdeen took advantage of a visit which the Queen paid to Louis Philippe at Eu in 1843, to discuss the whole matter with M. Guizot and with the King. On the part of France they disclaimed any intention of marrying the Queen of Spain or her sister to a French prince, and on the part of England and France it was mutually agreed to put no pressure on the Queen of Spain in the choice of a husband. Matters more or less drifted on till the moment when Lord Palmerston found himself once more at the Foreign Office; and negotiations were proceeding between him and the French ministry, when suddenly in September, 1846, the news arrived in London, that Louis Philippe and M. Guizot had secretly induced the young Queen of Spain to consent to marry the Duke of Cadiz, the most worthless Spanish prince among those eligible as her husband, and her sister to marry the Duc de Montpensier, Louis Philippe's own son.

Not only the ministry but public opinion in England was so incensed

incensed at what was considered the breach of faith and dishonesty involved in this transaction, that a complete estrangement with France ensued.

While the external policy of France had been mainly occupied in the Spanish question, the reform movement at home had become more and more the question of the hour.

Whether M. Guizot carried his objections to reform to a length which was irrational and unnecessary, is a point upon which historical students may differ; it is quite certain, that he was not responsible for the final collapse of the monarchy to which he was so much attached.

The story of it strikes the reader now as no less incredible than it seemed at the moment to those who were accustomed to watch political events. A serious émeute broke out in Paris on Tuesday, February 23rd, 1848, an émeute for which the ministers were quite prepared, and to meet which they had ample forces in readiness. On the following morning, February 24th, the émeute had grown into a serious insurrection, but still M. Guizot had no misgiving as to his power of dealing with it. That evening doubts arose as to the fidelity of the National Guards. M. Guizot was ready to put down the insurrection by force. The King refused, and dismissed the cabinet. While ineffectual efforts were being made to get M. Molé to form a ministry, the golden moments were fleeting; and while the King was acting on the fatal policy of appeasing the mob by promises of new ministers and of measures of reform, the insurrection was growing every hour more formidable. After failing with M. Molé he tried M. Odilon Barrot and M. Thiers; but by this time everybody as well as the King had lost their heads, and he was pressed on all sides to abdicate, by none more urgently than his own son the Duc de Montpensier. The Queen almost alone tried to rouse him to manly action. But Louis Philippe's nerve was gone. He abdicated, and fled from France in desperate haste. Such was the ignominious end of the monarchy of July.

Those who knew him well have said that, if the Duc d'Orléans had not been killed in a carriage accident in 1846, far different, on this occasion at all events, would have been the fate of the dynasty founded by his father. Well might Greville write in his journal, under the date of March 5th, 1848:

‘With the sufferers, as with the spectators, the predominant feeling is one of intense astonishment amounting to a sort of incredulity; . . . France on Monday, February 22nd, a powerful, peaceful, and apparently impregnable monarchy; on Wednesday, the 24th of the same month, the whole of her royalty scattered over the face of the earth, and France become a republic no less powerful and peaceful.’

No

No sketch of this reign, however slight, would be complete without a special allusion to some of those dramatic characters which, from time to time, appear upon its stage.

In front of all stand Talleyrand and La Fayette, like two links between the first and second revolutions—Talleyrand doing France excellent service as ambassador in England in his old age; La Fayette, dressed in the dress of '89, playing the game of '89 once more in his imagination, and annoyed that everyone else did not understand the rules of the game just as he did. In the early days of 1830—1 La Fayette was the idol of his countrymen. In the streets he was followed by admiring crowds; at the theatre the actors were made to sing songs in his honour, and at the mention of his name the audience rose to their feet; when he entered the Chamber, the deputies stood up; the King fawned upon him with caresses; the press declared, that his name and Napoleon's stood alone in the history of the century. And all this time the poor old man, quite intoxicated with vanity, was the tool of stronger and more extreme men than himself, his actions were marked by unwisdom, his conduct was feeble and irresolute. Alas! for popularity. When he died, a year or two after, the populace scarcely noticed his death.

While Talleyrand was doing all he could in London to minimize the effect of the revolution, and while La Fayette was doing his best in Paris to magnify it, a daring stroke was attempted in the south of France on behalf of the fallen monarchy. Nothing so dramatic as the escapade of the Duchesse de Berry, in 1832, has been seen in this commonplace century. This Princess was the mother of the young Duke of Bordeaux who, after the abdication of Charles X., had become head of the senior branch of the Bourbons. Romantic by nature, and weary of the ennui of the exiled court, she determined, against the policy and advice of the old King, to make a bold stroke for the recovery of the French throne. Her idea was that, if she could throw herself into the south and west of France, thousands of adherents would flock to join her, and enable her to raise the standard of revolt. Accordingly, in April 1832 she landed in Provence, and thence made her way into La Vendée. The rising in her son's favour was a fiasco of the most complete kind, but nothing even then could induce her to quit France. She adopted every conceivable disguise, passing from house to house and village to village, finding no fatigue and no peril come amiss, corresponding with the legitimists of every part of France, receiving their secret homage, traced everywhere, but everywhere unseizable by the police. She effected nothing for the cause of her son, but she was very happy. She



She was 'en plein Walter Scott.' According to M. Berryer, the Duchess was in France five or six months, up to the time when she finally took refuge in a house in Nantes. She had changed her domicile three or four times each week; at each of her retreats eight to ten persons had known her secret, and not once had she been betrayed. At length, on the 7th of November, her hiding-place at Nantes was made known to the Government, who were highly embarrassed what to do with their prize, but at last decided to place her in the citadel of Blaye. What was the scandal in France, when a few months afterwards she was delivered of a child in the fortress! She then confessed, that on her way to Provence she had been secretly married to a Sicilian nobleman in Italy. Being, therefore, no longer dangerous, she was liberated and allowed to leave the country.

While the performances of the Duchesse de Berry remind one of a heroine of Sir Walter Scott's novels, those of Prince Louis Napoleon in 1836 at Strasburg, and in 1840 at Boulogne, only recall those of a bad clown at a pantomime. To suborn a few officers, to surprise a few ignorant soldiers into crying 'Vive l'Empereur!', to make an oration, to promenade the streets, to gain no adherents, and to be then taken prisoner ignominiously, would, according to all previous experience, have been to make a man 'une quantité négligeable' from sheer ridicule. Such was the conduct of the future Napoleon III., but such was not its result.

At the end of the third volume of this history, the author has devoted nearly a hundred pages to the story of ten years of African war. Under this title, the story of the conquest and colonization of Algeria by the French is treated in an extremely interesting manner, and in a less diffuse style than that of the rest of the book. No one, desiring to read an account of this conquest from the years 1829 to 1839, can do better than turn to the pages of M. Thureau-Dangin. Many features will be found to resemble closely those of some of our own colonial acquisitions—a government at home with no fixed policy, inclined to avoid further anxieties or larger budgets, but unable for fear of public opinion to refuse the fruits of the restless energy of brilliant soldiers in her distant possessions. If Englishmen often recollect with sorrow the disasters which from time to time have fallen upon small bodies of the British army when engaged in warfare with savage tribes, they may take comfort from the fact that, in these pages, they will find the record of similar occasional disasters to the brave and brilliant soldiers of France. When many quantities are unknown, the  
military



military calculation must sometimes go wrong. The first unfortunate attempt to take Constantine, and its gallant storm the following year, are graphically described ; but in all these pages no event and no figure forces itself so strongly on the attention as that of the great Arab leader, Abd-el-Kader. The manner in which he formed and consolidated his power ; how he crushed all rivals and extended his domain at the expense of the prestige of France ; how he outwitted the French generals in the field of diplomacy, and never seemed weaker after successive defeats in war ; how deep was his religious fanaticism, and how true his patriotism ; how marvellous, in short, was the extent of his genius—all this the historian impartially puts forth up to the date to which he brings his story. The tale of the final struggle of Abd-el-Kader against the power of France will not be found in these volumes.

When there exists in a parliamentarily-governed State a large party bent on the destruction of the existing order of things, and when that party is aided and abetted by a political party, which does not desire the same ends, but which is blinded by the spirit of faction, or by its own theories ; if the party of order in that State ever wavers in the policy of resistance, then the party of destruction will sooner or later triumph. If this reflection is true, and we believe it to be so, no more instructive illustration of it can be found than in the history of the monarchy of July. The origin of this monarchy, as a monarchy, was clearly vicious from the beginning. A barricade may be a suitable cradle, and anarchy may be a convenient parent, for the empire of a Cæsar. Neither the one nor the other is what a prudent statesman would seek as the foundation of a republic. But for a constitutional monarchy ! the wonder is that Louis Philippe's crown remained on his head twelve months. Who were the king-makers of 1830 ? Were they men imbued with the monarchical principle, men convinced of the superiority of that form of government over all others ? No ; the men who held such views were partisans of Charles X. Many of them were probably painfully aware of the mistakes of that king, but they also felt that more evil than good would result from his overthrow. With a few individual exceptions the men, who put Louis Philippe on the throne, were political theorists and republicans. Theorists who were playing at a French 1688 : republicans, some of whom felt their time had not yet come, but the greater part of whom, the daring and doing men of the Hôtel de Ville, had been simply tricked into acquiescence in Louis Philippe's elevation. The true monarchists had therefore to be attracted, and the  
opponents

opponents of monarchy to be converted, to respect the principle as embodied in the monarchy of July; but how could a king attract respect to the monarchical principle, who at the moment of becoming king boasted, that his father had been a member of that Convention which had sent to the scaffold a king of his own blood? M. Thureau-Dangin accordingly continually impresses upon us, how devoid the bourgeoisie were of any real monarchical feeling, and how they paraded their intimacy with the King, not with the idea so much that it conferred honour upon them, as from pleasure in dragging him down to their own level. In reply to some animadversions against 'the press of the streets,' the '*National*,' the organ of Armand Carrel, one of the king-makers of 1830, but later an ardent Republican, wrote:—

'And what are you yourselves? what is your origin? Is not your royalty a mob-made royalty?—mob-made royalty, mob-made ministers, mob-made deputies. Without the investiture of the mob, which relieved you from your oaths of fidelity to three generations of Bourbons, you would be nothing but traitors, who had deserted your lawful King the day when he summoned you to defend him against the mob.'

During the illuminations of July, 1831, a Parisian put in his window his own portrait and that of the King, with these lines written underneath:—

'Il n'est point de distance entre Philippe et moi;  
Il est roi-citoyen, je suis citoyen-roi.'

If therefore the real foundation of Louis Philippe's throne was the bourgeoisie, at the best it must be confessed it was but a slender prop. Carrel has wittily but truly sketched the bourgeois of this time in the following words, which would be spoilt by translation:—

'Avez-vous quelquefois interrogé un de ces gens paisibles, excellents citoyens au fond, mais peu prévoyants, et qui s'étaient laissés enrégimenter dans le juste milieu, sous M. Périer? . . . Demandez à cet homme s'il est royaliste, il vous répondra qu'il est abonné depuis quinze ans au Constitutionnel, et que sans doute vous vous moquez. Républicain? Pas davantage; mais il sent les conséquences de la révolution de Juillet. Propagandiste? Il a horreur du mot, depuis qu'il a lu le discours de M. Périer; mais il tiendrait beaucoup cependant à ce que la France fût encore la grande nation, car il a dans sa bibliothèque, à côté d'un beau Voltaire, une superbe édition des "*Victoires et Conquêtes*" de M. Panckoucke, et il a été révolté de l'abandon de la Pologne. Notre homme n'est rien de ce qui fait un royaliste; il est, au contraire, implacable ennemi des chouans, des prêtres, des émigrés et de la Sainte-Alliance; il a toute l'étoffe d'un républicain, seulement il ne le sait pas; il a peur du mot et pas de  
la

la chose. Il prendrait son parti de la république, si elle pouvait venir sans trouble ; mais, en attendant, il est pour l'ordre public, ou mieux encore pour la tranquillité.'

There was clearly not much material there for the support of the monarchy of July under adverse circumstances ; no prospect of active help, but no fear of active hostility. Far otherwise was it with the real revolutionaries tricked out of their republic, which, it is true, they had not dared to proclaim, but the prospect of which nevertheless they had hugged to their hearts. As they had not got a republic, they determined that the monarchy should be only a republic in disguise. Hence the disorders, the anarchy, of the ministry of M. Laffitte. That sapient statesman was a bourgeois of the bourgeois, and he and his government acted to the life the part of the bourgeois of the 'National.' They did not like what was going on, but their relentless French logic said to them, 'You men of July must "vouloir les conséquences" of this revolution,' and they had not the courage to say that anything was not 'les conséquences,' which the men of the barricades declared were 'les conséquences.' We have seen how the evil brought its own cure in the advent to office of M. Casimir Périer, and how the policy of resistance was followed unhesitatingly for six years.

Mark how the attitude of the revolutionary party changes. From the moment when they are crossed in their plan of republicanizing the monarchy, they declare war against that monarchy and follow the King with an odious persecution. He is libelled in their press, insulted in the grossest caricatures, his life over and over again attempted. The objects of the party are openly avowed, at first republican, then republican and socialist. Secret societies and clubs are formed ; the workmen are tempted to join by that phrase so dear to the Parisian communist of to-day, 'l'organisation du travail.' The plan of campaign is to attack the monarchy of July and all its institutions with a relentless war, and to render its rule impossible. These long series of attacks against the Government and the conditions of society, in the press and in pamphlets and in public harangues, are but steps to the organization of formidable societies, which in their turn pave the way to sanguinary insurrections and émeutes in the streets of the great cities. The attempts to assassinate the King are the natural fruit of the bitter attacks on him personally. This party of revolution, however, has little or no following in the Chambers. But has it no friends there ? The Government is engaged in a struggle against anarchy and revolution. There is a parliamentary opposition in the Chambers it is true, but it is a monarchical  
opposition

opposition and a civilized opposition, and yet in this great struggle it throws all its weight against the Government and for the revolutionaries and anarchists. M. Odilon Barrot himself and all his followers of the left were the supporters of the monarchy of July; there was not one of them who had anything but horror of the doctrines of the socialists; and if this was true of the left, much more so was it of the left-centre. Yet these politicians fought their best on behalf of men from whom they differed on the first principles of government and of civilization, and did all they could to thwart a ministry with whom they differed about what were in comparison trivial details.

Perhaps the monarchy of July is not the only monarchy, nor France the only country, which has seen this edifying spectacle. It is one of those blessings which are apparently reserved only for parliamentarily-governed nations. The *modus operandi* of the opposition was twofold. In the first place, it tried to shield its protégés from the just consequences of their illegal acts, and to prevent more stringent laws against disorder being passed. In the second place, by deftly delivered attacks, it weakened and degraded the monarchy. Even in the early days of Casimir Périer the opposition affected in speaking of the insurgents a hypocritical compassion and impartiality, while they kept all their severity of expression for those on whom the duty had fallen to maintain order. 'They had been too hasty;' or 'the soldiers had shown a grievous animus against the population.' M. Dupin had good reason for saying from the tribune, 'There is no disorder and no émeute which does not find in the Chamber apologists or some party to make excuses for it.' After the terrible émeute of June 5, 1832, the whole energy of the left was turned to prevent justice being done on those responsible for this hideous crime; and when, in 1834 and 1835, the amendments and additions to the criminal law were introduced into the Chamber of Deputies, their passage through that house was combated with a passionate zeal by the whole opposition. Faithful to the line they had adopted, after the émeute of June 5, 1832, every nerve was strained to prevent and obstruct the trial of the insurrectionaries of April 1834, from Lyons and Paris, before the Court of Peers—'Vainement l'opposition avait-elle tout fait pour contrarier ou intimider la Cour des Pairs, celle-ci n'en avait pas moins mené à fin l'instruction de cet immense procès,' as our historian puts it. We have already noticed what grave damage was done by M. Thiers in coquetting with the left, and by his conduct in opposition between the periods of his two ministries.

It

It remains to illustrate the nature of the harm done to the monarchy and to the Conservative, as distinct from the revolutionary cause. Under the Molé ministry, and again under the ministry formed during the émeute of May 12, 1839, the question of the allowances and dowries of the King's children came before the Chamber. On both occasions the opportunity was seized to drag Louis Philippe and all the royal family in the mud. The matter was treated on the lines of a bargain between two Jews in a curiosity shop, with the result, on both occasions, of the King's requests being partly or wholly refused. The game of the revolutionaries was clear; but what could be the purpose of the great mass of the majority, by which these votes were rejected, avowed adherents of the monarchy of July? Well might Henry Heine write in the 'Augsburg Gazette' in 1840:—

'What inconsistency! You recoil in terror from the republic, and you publicly insult your King! And for a fact they do not desire the republic, these noble knights of the dollar, these lords of industry, these chosen men of the propertied classes, these enthusiasts for the peaceable enjoyment of their property, who form the majority of the French Parliament! They have even more horror of the republic than the King himself; they tremble before it even more than Louis Philippe, who has already had experience of it in his youth.'

It is not necessary to repeat the story of the coalition, and the harm it did. It is, however, worth noticing, that the doctrinaires, who took part in it, especially M. Duvergier de Hauranne, were largely moved by theories in their action. They had intended, in 1830, to establish a constitutional monarchy of the pure English type. In its development under Louis Philippe, the actual monarchy did not quite correspond to their ideal; and in order to correct the bearings of their monarchy a few points, they plunged with ardour into an attack, the blow from which really fell on the institution of monarchy itself.

Another strong example of the breach, which was being gradually made in the policy of resistance, was the amnesty to all political offenders, which was proclaimed by M. Molé on the occasion of the marriage of the young Duc d'Orléans. By it all the revolutionaries, condemned for participation in the insurrections of the reign, were once more brought back to France, where they instantly recommenced plotting against the King and against the Government. Like the republic of to-day, which, in its turn, has proclaimed its amnesty to its communists, the monarchy of July reaped nothing but evil from this political sop thrown by a weak ministry to the parliamentary left. What is the use of crying peace when there is no peace, or of having  
soft

soft moments in a theatrical manner in face of a foe, who is never soft, and therefore always formidable?

The constant changes of ministries, nearly as frequent as in 1887, the long duration of the crises between the fall of the old ministry and the formation of the new one, all tended to weaken the executive government, while an ominous sign of the recovery of the revolutionary party from its depression under the policy of resistance, was the émeute which broke out during the two months' crisis in 1839. Strong testimony is repeatedly borne in this book to the weakened condition of the institutions of the country in 1839-40-41. The nuncio of the Pope in Paris wrote: 'Le pouvoir royal a immensément diminué à la suite des crises parlementaires.' Béranger wrote to his friends: 'The coalition has just struck a terrible blow to the throne, and what is curious is, that it is the monarchists who have brought it to this piteous state.'

On M. Guizot becoming President of the Council, he had to begin the work of Casimir Périer over again, but the event showed, that the institutions of the country had received a shock from which they were not destined to recover, and that the revolutionary party had acquired a force not easily to be daunted or destroyed. Yet when the crisis came, it was not the insurgents who won the day, but the King who ignobly lost it. M. Guizot was ready to carry out the policy of resistance to its logical conclusion. The King was afraid, and tried to appease the mob by changing his ministers. When the inevitable failure of this piece of cowardice was clear even to the King, and when he was hesitatingly turning back to M. Guizot and vigorous measures, then M. Thiers persuaded him to keep the troops at a distance, while he and M. Odilon Barrot went out to calm the people. M. Odilon Barrot was true to his old recipe of moral force. The reception they met with from the triumphant mob was such as might be imagined. The men who led the mob were not given to soft moments; they marched straight towards their goal, always taking, never giving. Louis Philippe had, at the critical point, deliberately chosen to give instead of to take. He ended by giving up the crown, which the party of destruction ended by taking. Verily a French royalist has more to complain of in the Bourbons than a French republican. Verily he must, on putting down his history of modern France, feel inclined to cry aloud, 'Plus de Bourbons!' Have ever three princes of any other family thrown away their crowns, as Louis XVI., Charles X., and Louis Philippe, did in the space of sixty years? Opinions will always be divided, as to whether or no a Louis XIV. could



have retained his crown, where Louis XVI. lost it. Some may believe that no energy or wisdom on the part of Charles X. could have maintained his position when once the revolution of July had broken out. Few, very few, can doubt, that Louis Philippe fell from sheer cowardice, and want of nerve and pluck. The conditions, in which Louis XVI. had found himself, were beyond his experience, and far beyond the scope of his feeble and weak intellect to deal with. Moreover, he had no trustworthy ministers, no wise friends about him, and no army on which he could confidently rely. Charles X. had the army at his back, but he was old, and badly advised, and was confronted by a solidly hostile body in the Chamber of Deputies. Yet, when he quitted France, he did so doggedly, and in a slow and dignified manner. It was reserved for Louis Philippe, ripe in political experience, with a faithful army at his side, supported by a large majority in the Chambers, with a practised statesman for his minister ready and willing to act, it was reserved for him to disgrace his name by flying from his kingdom like a hunted rat.

In what way does the attitude of the English Gladstonian party in 1888 differ from that of the left of the French Chamber under Louis Philippe? They are bound to one large party, and to the embryos of two other parties, with whom they have really nothing essential in common. The Irish-American party wishes the harm, not the good, of England, and of the British Empire. It is imbued with ideas on the rights of property, and the construction of a civilized community, which it would be an insult to the Gladstonian Liberals to suppose that they share. It is really a republican party—the American branch avowedly so; the Irish branch confesses it by studiously omitting every ceremony, and avoiding every act and word, which could give a pretext for supposing them to be attached to the monarchical principle. Who are in the closest relations with the Irish-Americans—the main body of the Gladstonian party, or their extreme left, in which lie the two embryos already mentioned? Who can doubt but that the extreme left of the Gladstonian party will, within a few years, be an avowedly republican party, having mysterious relations with, and shading out into, a communistic party? Has not the oracle itself announced at Nottingham that the lion's share of the spoils of war will fall to the left wing of the party? This must naturally be the case. The Irish-Americans have now the whole Gladstonian party at their heels, because they always took everything, and gave nothing. The men, who will form the leaders of the republican and communistic parties of the future, will adopt the same principle, and, laughing in their sleeves, will drag behind them the Gladstonian



Gladstonian Girondins, afraid of their own shadows, anxious to be 'marching with the times.' Is it not evident from the whole course of the Trafalgar Square controversy, that there is no *sharp line of demarcation* anywhere left between the Gladstonian party and the social democrats? They shade off into each other by imperceptible degrees. The most extreme men are usually the most energetic, and when once they have got a foothold in a political party, they show themselves veritable power-grabbers. They will add acre to acre of political influence, till they have obtained that same ascendancy among the heirs of the present Gladstonian party as is the bane and the danger of modern republicans in France. It is amusing to notice how threadbare and ancient are all the most heroic attitudes, watchwords, and declamations, of the present Gladstonian-Parnellite party. There is not one of their pet stage properties, which is not borrowed from the French opposition of the monarchy of July. The morbid and childish terror of a certain literary Gladstonian, lest he should be thought not to be a genuine Liberal, corresponds exactly with the position of those politicians who, in 1830, countenanced the most atrocious acts as being 'les conséquences' of the revolution of July. It is probable that he could be made to march 'with the times' and his party—anywhere.

We have become accustomed to the attempts of the national press in Ireland to intimidate jurors from executing their duty without fear or favour. This is copied from the revolutionary French press of 1832. Such was the intimidation practised then, that the juries took refuge in secret voting. Furious at being balked of their prey, the hostile journals asserted juries to be public officials, that it was the duty of the press to register the action of each individual juror, and accordingly that they intended to publish periodical lists of the condemnations with the names of the jurors. 'United Ireland' in 1887 could have borrowed a leaf out of the book of the 'Tribune' of 1832. In Ireland, again, 'the martyrs,' a term borrowed from French anarchists, when brought before a set of 'servile lacqueys' (a term also borrowed from the same source) called judges, are in the habit of posing as accusers of the vile British Government, and declaiming in a theatrical manner, amidst the applause of the enlightened populace. The same was done at every trial by the anarchists of 1832 and 1834, amid the frantic applause of the canaille of Paris. Of the French left M. Thureau-Dangin says:—

'Ils voient dans les troubles l'œuvre d'une police ténébreuse, ou du moins reprochent au ministère de les avoir laissés volontairement

grossir. Ils demandent à grand bruit des enquêtes, non sur le crime de la révolte, mais sur celui de la répression.'

Could the attitude of the choice spirits of the Gladstonian-Parnellite party towards a riot, whether in Ireland or the Hebrides, in Wales or in Trafalgar Square, be more exactly described? Or again in this passage:—

'Enfin pour faire oublier qu'elle était accusée, l'opposition se faisait accusatrice; elle reprochait au gouvernement d'avoir, par ses propres méfaits, légitimé la rébellion; elle imputait à la police d'avoir provoqué le combat, à l'armée d'avoir commencé le feu.'

Finally, this passage, from a French radical journal, on the September laws passed at the instigation of the De Broglie, Guizot, and Thiers cabinet in 1835, shames the 'Daily News' of to-day out of all pretence to originality:—

'La terreur est mise à l'ordre du jour. . . La terreur de 93 fut révolutionnaire et provisoire: la terreur de 1835 est légale et permanente.'

The Home Rule party seem desirous of posing as the heaven-sent interpreters of a novel problem; but the fact is, that the struggle between the Unionists and the Separatists in its various phases is but a repetition of a story told over and over again in the pages of History. From the subject of this article, the steadfast politician of to-day can learn, that disorder and revolution, in whatever shape, must be met by all who trust in the supremacy of law, without hesitation, without flinching, and without quarter. The timid politician also may assure himself, that he will gain nothing by running away, and that the best terms come to those who resist with the greatest resolution and persistency.

To those who are fond of political prophecies the sequel of the history of the Monarchy of July will furnish useful hints. On the ruins of that monarchy was founded an unpopular republic, much as on the ruins of the United Kingdom would be founded an Irish government with neither hope nor reputation. Just as the citizens of Paris planted trees of liberty on their boulevards, so doubtless the patriots of Dublin would rename their streets; and as the French republic of 1848 collapsed like an empty sack, so would the Irish Nationalist structure fail. It would fail from inability to govern. Without reverence and confidence liberal government is impossible; and in the Irish Nationalist party of the present day there is little to be found that men of truth and of intelligence can trust or can revere.

- ART. VII. — 1. *Kaspar Hauser, nicht unwahrscheinlich ein Betrüger.* Berlin, 1830.  
 2. *Kaspar Hauser. Beispiel eines Verbrechens,* 1832.  
 3. *Materialien zur Geschichte Kaspar Hausers, von dem Grafen Stanhope.* Heidelberg, 1835.  
 4. *Enthüllungen über Kaspar Hauser,* 1858.  
 5. *Kaspar Hauser, seine Lebensgeschichte.* Von Kolb. 1883.  
 6. *Kaspar Hauser, neugeschichtliche Legende.* Von Linde. 1887.

THERE are certain mysterious incidents in history which may be said to undergo periodical occultations: they appear, they vanish, and they appear again; renewing investigation, refreshing interest, and yet destined to relapse into obscurity. Of such a kind was the story of the 'Man with the Iron Mask' in the seventeenth century, and of such a kind was the strangest of all stories of our day—that of Kaspar Hauser. We say justly of our day, for there must be some still living who remember the individual himself; although the greater number of this generation have probably never heard of him. This story has been brought forward again by recent works; it is time therefore to ascertain how far the lapse of time has, or has not, contributed to clear away the mystery in which it has been enveloped. If the narrative transmitted to us can be proved to be true, it represents certainly one of the most extraordinary cases that ever occurred; or, if proved not to be true, one of the boldest of impostures. We will endeavour to present both aspects as impartially as may be. Unfortunately there is much to regret, in the confused style in which it is related by the one class of witnesses, and in the sceptical tone with which it is referred to by the other.

The scene opened in the old town of Nuremberg on the afternoon of Whit-Monday, the 26th of May, 1828, when a shoemaker, who lived in an unfrequented part of the town, perceived a young lad not far from him, standing against a wall in a constrained attitude, apparently like an intoxicated person unable to control the movement of his limbs. On approaching him, the lad held out a letter directed to the Captain of the 4th Squadron of Light Horse in Nuremberg. At the same time he kept repeating some unintelligible words, or rather sounds, accompanied with moans and tears, and signs of the greatest distress. These words, which were repeated so often in the first days of his life in Nuremberg as to be known by heart by many, are printed in German as follows:—'*Reuta wähn,*' or sometimes '*I mücht a Reuta wähn wie mei Votta wähn ist*' (I wish to become a rider, or trooper, as my father was); also, 'Woas

'*Woas nit*' (I don't know); and, '*Ross ham*' (horse at home). He is stated to have known about fifty sounds—those only that we have given being understood,—and to have repeated them without any sense of their meaning. The Captain, to whom the letter was addressed, lived close at hand. The worthy citizen assisted the stranger, who was ready to sink with exhaustion, to reach the house. Fatigue and hunger were written on his face. They brought him meat, which he put in his mouth, but spat out again immediately with signs of disgust. For wine and beer he showed the same aversion, but being offered bread and water, he ate and drank eagerly. The officer in question was not at home; and the servant, not knowing what to do with the strange and suffering apparition, took him to the stable, where he sank down on some straw in a deep sleep.

As immediate instances of the inaccuracy and confusion with which this strange incident was greeted, may be cited two different versions of the letter to the Captain, both dated 'from a place near the Bavarian frontier which shall be nameless, 1828.' The writer declared himself to be a poor day-labourer with ten children of his own, and stated that the lad's mother had left him as a child at his house on October 7th, 1812, but that he had never been able to discover who she was, and added that the lad wished to enter the army and the same regiment where his father had served; and that he had been taught to read and write. But the letter was ill-spelt, and marked by vulgar and brutal rhodomontade, evidently intended to mislead. According to one version it concluded thus: 'If you do not want to keep him, you may kill him, or hang him up the chimney.' According to the other: 'If you do not want to keep him, you may put him into a lottery, or get rid of him in any way you please.' All this was written in German, and in German characters. There was a note enclosed in the Latin character, still worse written and spelt, but evidently by the same hand and of the same time: 'The child is already baptized. You must give him a surname yourself. You must educate him. His father was one of the Light Horse! When he is seventeen years old send him to Nuremberg to the regiment of Light Horse, for there his father was. I ask for his education until he is seventeen. He was born the 30th April, 1812. I am a poor girl, and cannot support him.' It is easy to perceive the counterfeit character of these notes. On the Captain's return to his house he could furnish no clue to the letter, no key to the strange sounds, and throw no light on his unexpected inmate. The poor creature was therefore.

therefore, with difficulty, roused from his sleep, and dragged, with many a tear and groan, to the police-office. When there, he was of course asked the usual questions—what was his name, what his business, and where his passport? He continued to utter the same sounds, though not in the sense of an answer, for he evidently knew not what question and answer meant. And the police as little knew to what class to assign him, whether to that of idiot, madman, savage, or impostor. This last conjecture received at least temporary confirmation from the following circumstance. Not understanding a word he said, and bethinking themselves to try whether he could write, they handed him pen and ink, and laid a piece of paper before him; on which, to the astonishment of all present, he wrote in legible characters the name '*Kaspar hauser*.' His name being thus given, he was desired to add that of the place whence he came. This produced only a repetition of the same '*Reuta wahn*,' &c. And, as nothing could be made of the strange being, he was led with help, groaning and tottering, to the tower of the Vestner Gate, used as a place of confinement for rogues and vagabonds, and locked in a cell with another prisoner, where he immediately fell asleep. It may here be added that the very name of Kaspar Hauser, which took the police so much by surprise, appears to have been in keeping with the tone of odious derision which renders this tale so peculiarly revolting. For his German biographers interpret the name of '*Hauser*' to mean one kept always indoors. But that he had received, as stated in the letter, some teaching in writing, was beyond doubt. On the first days of his incarceration the gaoler gave him pencil and paper to amuse him. Kaspar eagerly seized both, placed the paper on a bench, began to write, and continued to do so, without allowing himself to be disturbed, till he had filled the sheet on all four sides. The appearance of this sheet, which is preserved with other documents, is much the same as if he had had a child's first copybook before him.

We may describe him more closely now. On his first appearance in Nuremberg, Kaspar Hauser was 4 feet 9 inches in height, and apparently seventeen years old—the first down being already seen on his lip—his wisdom-teeth still wanting. His face was devoid of all meaning, except that of a brutish obtuseness; though, when anything pleased him, a sweet expression flitted over it, like the smile of a baby. There was also a perceptible difference between the two sides of the face. The left side was drawn somewhat awry, and frequently distorted by convulsive spasms. On both arms was the scar of inoculation. His hair was light and curling. He was stout and

and broad-shouldered, without any bodily defect, except a recently inflicted small wound on one arm; his limbs delicately formed; his hands small and well shaped; his feet the same, though freshly blistered all over; but the soles as soft as the palm of a lady's hand, or as his own, which had evidently never touched anything harder than each other. His dress was of a miscellaneous kind—old things, and coarse and ill-fitting—in some respects like the costume of the peasantry; in others like that of the dwellers in towns. His round felt hat had an engraving of Munich, half scratched out, inside. Round his neck was a checked red handkerchief, marked in red thread, 'K. H.' In a pocket was a rosary, a key, a paper of gold sand, and a number of printed German prayers and tracts. No proper importance was attached by the police to these forms of circumstantial evidence; some of which were thrown away. This extraordinary being noticed nothing, recognized nothing; common objects and daily occurrences passed before him without attracting more observation than from a child of a year old. But, like a child, he grasped at glittering, shining objects, and cried when he found them out of his reach. Like a child, too, on first seeing a lighted splinter—the form of candle apparently then in use—he was so delighted that he put his hand into the flame, and then cried with the pain. Also, when first a looking-glass was held before him, he looked behind it to see who was concealed.

His first days, in what was evidently a new world to him, were not calculated to throw any light on his antecedents. For all Nuremberg flocked together to the guard-house to gaze at the curious being who had dropped apparently from the clouds; and steps that ought to have been at once taken, and depositions that ought to have been at once collected, were neglected in the gratification of vulgar wonder and curiosity. He had fallen in one sense among good Samaritans, but there is no denying that, at that time at least, Nuremberg represented an actual and living *Krähwinkel*, and her citizens the characters in Kotzebue's '*Kleine Städte*.' When an attempt was at length made to report the strange event with some precision, the official documents show the proceedings of the police to have been so irregular, and the depositions of the witnesses so contradictory, that beyond the undeniable facts, conveyed unconsciously by the poor passive chief witness himself, little that is trustworthy can be gathered. We have therefore only to record those facts as plainly as we can.

It has been said that Kaspar Hauser's person bore no sign of any defect; but it is equally true that it bore unmistakeable indications

indications of a peculiar condition and habit continued for years. From the conformation of his lower limbs it appeared that his life had hitherto been passed in a seated posture—his legs stretched out before him on the ground, at right angles with his body. The knees accordingly exhibited a marked deviation from the usual form. Under a normal condition, the patella or knee-pan, when the leg is extended, shows a slight projection—with Kaspar Hauser it lay in a considerable hollow. When seated in his habitual position, with thigh and leg stretched horizontally before him, the knee-joint lay so close to the floor that a common card could hardly be thrust under the ham-string. It was evident also that he had been confined for years in a place, where he had neither had room to stand upright, to lie at full length, nor even to creep and crawl as a strong child instinctively does. Here was a human being, therefore, who could neither walk nor speak like other men, whose eyes could not bear the light, who had hitherto eaten nothing but bread and water, and who was not less than from sixteen to seventeen years of age! What a dark tale was outlined here for the human moralist! What a curious psychological subject offered to the scientist and moral philosopher! What a sore problem for the tender and humane!

Those who had the charge of him soon became convinced that, though utterly devoid of all that knowledge which the merest child intuitively imbibes from contact with its fellows, the senses of this unfortunate being were endowed with a preternatural acuteness. His eyes suffered from the light, and became much inflamed; but at the same time no darkness existed for him. In the night he moved about with perfect confidence and security, seeing even more clearly than in the full day. His hearing was equally sensitive. He heard footsteps at distances impossible to one in a normal condition. They also discovered that of all his senses that of smell was the most abnormal. The scent of flowers, even of the rose, was insupportable to him, and never ceased to be so. A walk or drive which took him near gardens or fields was a sort of martyrdom. Nor was it only the scent of flowers which acted on him. He could distinguish the apple, pear, and plum tree by the smell of their leaves; he was, indeed, incommoded by smells imperceptible to any one else; the paint on walls and the dye of clothes gave him pain; the smell of raw meat was intolerable to him; while the effluvia from a churchyard, not in the least perceptible to one walking with him, threw him into a state of convulsion. It was to be expected that a being, still retaining such untempered conditions

of



of sense, would be equally over-susceptible to magnetic influences. This became apparent before he left the prison, when a little toy with an iron front was given him, accompanied by a small magnet, by which it was made to move in any direction in a basin of water. On taking up this magnet Kaspar Hauser was disagreeably affected, and made signs that he felt pain. This induced a gentleman to observe carefully further effects. Accordingly, on holding the north pole towards him, Kaspar showed by his actions that he felt himself drawn, as if by a current of air, in an outward direction; while, if the position of the magnet was reversed, the current of air seemed to blow towards him: and, though the experiment was often repeated and varied, he never made a mistake. Such experiments, however, could not be continued without his feeling distressed, and breaking out into profuse perspiration. Nor did he ever err in distinguishing blindfold one metal from another by the difference of sensation and strength of attraction. Even—so the tale goes—when a needle lay, unknown to all, under a heap of blankets, the feeling of being blown upon, which he always expressed, enabled him to detect it. At the same time the veins of the hand most exposed to the metallic influence swelled visibly.

Among the few intelligible words in his small vocabulary that of '*Ross*'—the German equivalent for our '*Steed*'—was most frequently repeated, sometimes, in accents of entreaty, with tears in his eyes, as if begging to have a horse. Whenever also any trumpery was given him, such as bits of ribbon, a tin toy, or coin, he cried '*Ross! Ross!*' and showed by his actions that he wanted to hang them on something. It was not difficult to procure toys in a city which is their very home, and, as he at first spent his days seated on the floor in the guard-room, one of the soldiers hit on the idea of giving him a wooden horse upon wheels. From that moment a change came over the poor creature. With a countenance beaming through tears, he took the horse to his side, stroking and caressing it, and then proceeded to hang upon it all the glittering and tinkling trifles which the kindness of his visitors had brought him. For hours together he continued thus employed; too much absorbed to observe anything that went on round him. More toy horses were soon added, serving to multiply his occupation, but never to vary it. For day after day found him in the same position on the floor, decorating and undecorating his stud with untiring patience, and wheeling them backwards and forwards, though always as noiselessly as he could; for he explained later that, if the wheels made a noise, he should be  
beaten.

beaten. This accounted for the wound on his arm when he first appeared: his keeper, or 'the Man,' as he called him, having struck him for making too much noise.

Thus far we have endeavoured to describe the picture he presented, both in mind and body, to the wondering gossips of Nuremberg. This condition gradually changed with the changed conditions around him, but the first teachings he received did not run smooth. Surrounded at all hours of the day by a number of visitors intent only on gratifying the idlest curiosity, it is no wonder that the gentle and orderly system, which Nature and common-sense would have prescribed towards such a phenomenon, was neglected. Here apparently was a forlorn human creature, whose mind was literally that sheet of white paper, which, in other cases, serves only as a figure of speech. Left at first to the sport of the ignorant and mischievous, it was soon scrawled over with heterogeneous rubbish, worse than useless to it, while the torpor and want of practice, which seemed to envelop his senses, as well as his mind, rendered him the victim of the most unseemly tricks. One person stuffed snuff up his nostrils—another put a pipe in his mouth—a third forced raw brandy upon him, which acted like a kind of poison. His eyes seemed to notice no object in room or landscape, and his ears at first took no note of the ringing of bells or striking of clocks. Feigned cuts and thrusts were accordingly made at him, with a naked sword, without his blinking or showing the slightest fear; while to test his hearing a simpleton discharged a pistol full at him. We do not learn the effect of that; but on the occasion of a military parade, soon after his appearance on the Nuremberg stage, when he was placed close to the great regimental drum, the first blows on it threw him into convulsions. Nor was he more wisely treated by teachers of a higher class. With that want of practical sense with which, rightly or wrongly, the good Germans are credited, his volunteer tutors, both lay and clerical, set about their tasks in a strangely topsy-turvy fashion. The masters, who proffered to teach him to speak, began by dissertations on the formation of language; while the pastors, who sought to teach him religion, started by such abstruse principles as that God had neither form nor substance, and that He had created all things out of nothing.

But if in certain respects utterly dull to outward impressions, there were signs from the first of more than average intelligence, which, though not to be hurried, was always latently there. At the same time his feeble and undeveloped brain seemed unequal to any exertion. The attention evoked by a new word or thing  
would

would immediately arouse the spasms of which we have spoken, and these would be followed by a kind of nervous rigidity; he would then stand motionless, his eyes wide open, without winking, deaf, dumb, and blind to all external impressions, while evidently going through the laborious exercise of the new faculty of thought. All this proved too much for the weak and untried nerves; he lost strength, was continually in tears, and puzzled the doctors how to treat a patient who refused everything but bread and water.

The only relief to the narrative of monotonous folly, with which he was at first treated, is furnished by the account of the gaoler, Herr Hiltel, a plain and sensible man. After observing him quietly for a few days, he became convinced that there was no idiocy, or any neglect of Nature in the case; but that in some diabolical way he had been denied all those means by which the human mind is appointed to learn, to reason, and to grow. He bears witness that, during the early time of his abode in the prison, the poor lad's conduct was, in artlessness and innocence, precisely that of a little child. After the fifth day he removed him from the upper and more strictly kept part of the tower to the lower story; placing him where all his movements could be observed without his knowledge. But it was always the same childish and childlike being; absorbed in his horses and other playthings. In other respects too the same perfect innocence was evinced. This was seen in one particular and pathetic fact, for, on the gaoler and his wife undressing him for the purpose of ablution, his demeanour was exactly that of a little child—natural and unconscious—not knowing that he was naked. The gaoler was his best friend; he could not protect him from the host of visitors, but he admitted him to his own humble table, where, although not able to partake of the food, he learned to sit upon a chair, and to use his hands like a human being. He also allowed his own son and little daughter to be much with him. The boy helped him to speak, and taught him his letters far more successfully than his older masters; the little girl showed him how to string beads, which delighted him for a time. His next occupation was to decorate the walls of his little cell with the small coloured prints which his visitors brought him; pasting them on with his own saliva, which—a fact for the pathologist to solve—was of the consistency of glue.

Kaspar Hauser had also another friend in the person of Herr Binder, the Burgomaster. Though far from grasping the exceptional nature of the apparent case, he soon saw that the common forms of official business did not apply to it. He directed

directed him to be frequently brought to his house, when, as far as the lad's growing capacity and vocabulary admitted, he questioned him as to the facts of his life. From frequent repetitions of these interrogations, Herr Binder extracted, or thought he extracted, the materials of a statement, which, in July 1828, was formally issued to the citizens of Nuremberg in the form of an official promulgation. It was to this effect:—

He neither knows who he is, nor where he was born. It was only at Nuremberg that he came into the world, and knew that there were other men in it beside 'the Man,' who was his keeper, and himself. As long as he can recollect he had always been in a hole, or small place which he sometimes calls a cage—always seated on the ground, with bare feet, and a shirt and pair of trowsers for all clothing. In this place he never heard a sound, nor saw real daylight. He slept much, and when he woke always found a loaf of bread, and a vessel of water at his side. In winter the place was heated by a small stove, like a beehive. Sometimes the water had a bad taste, what he afterwards knew to be the taste of laudanum; and when this was the case he fell asleep again, not being able to keep his eyes open. And on waking he found that he had on what he now knows to be a clean shirt, and that his nails had been cut, and his hair trimmed. In his hole he had two wooden horses, and several ribbons. Upon the whole he had been much happier there than in the world where he had so much to suffer. How long he had been shut up he knows not, as he had no knowledge of time. That the man did him no harm; except one day when he had been running his horses too hard, when he struck him on the arm with a stick, causing the wound alluded to. About this time also 'the Man' came into his hole, placed a small table over his feet, and spread something on it which he afterwards knew to be paper. He then came behind him and guided his hand backwards and forwards on the paper with something he had put between his fingers. He, Kaspar, was greatly pleased with the dark figures which appeared on the white paper, and was never tired of repeating them. 'The Man' renewed these visits often. Also another time he came again, lifted him from the place where he lay, and endeavoured to teach him how to stand and walk. This was done thus. He came behind and seized him round the body, placed his feet behind Kaspar's feet, and lifted them forward in steps. The last time he came, he stood before him with his back turned, lifted Kaspar's hands over his shoulders, tied them fast in front, and carried him on his back out of the hole. He was carried either up or down a hill; he knows not which,

which, by which it appears he meant a flight of stairs. The Man took much trouble to teach him to walk, which always gave him great pain. The putting on of his boots caused him much suffering. The Man made him sit on the ground, seized him from behind, drew his feet up, and forced them into the boots, after which they proceeded more miserably than ever. The clothes he wore were put on him not long before he was seen at Nuremberg. He neither perceived nor remarked any objects around him, nor could he tell in what direction and from what part of the country they had come, nor how long they were on the way. All he knew was that the man, who had been leading him, put the letter into his hand and then vanished.

This may be considered the sum total of what Kaspar Hauser could remember of his life. Glimmerings of a bygone time, affording much speculation to those about him, came out later, but led to nothing.

About seven weeks after his first appearance in Nuremberg the young lad was released from his abode in the prison, and formally committed to the care of Professor Daumer, a school-master, who resided in the town. At the same time the magistrates issued an advertisement announcing the fact, that they had given the charge of the homeless Kaspar Hauser to a well-qualified instructor, and that in future the public would be refused admission to him. At Professor Daumer's house he was for the first time furnished with a bed, which greatly pleased him. He often said, that his bed was the only pleasant thing he had found in a world where everything gave him pain. The process of assuming the faculties of life seems to have been, mentally and physically, as painful to him as that of resuming them is to one recovering from drowning. That restless pain and pleasure of existence, for which children are gradually trained, had to be suddenly and consciously acquired, as by one born out of due time. In Mr. Daumer's family he acquired the art of speech far more rapidly, and it may be considered significant of the unvarying laws of nature, that, exceptional as were the age and other conditions of the learner, the process was the same as if he had been two or three years old instead of seventeen. A child always begins by using the third person. It is 'Bobby' who wants such a thing, not 'I.' It was the same with this old child. 'Kaspar very well'; nor did he understand being addressed as 'You.' His friends had to say, 'How is Kaspar?' Like a child also, the question 'Why?' was incessantly repeated. We are told that it required immense patience to teach him things which appear matters of course to us; such as the difference between animate and inanimate objects: between voluntary movement and

and that which is communicated from without. He thought that the picture or image of a man must feel like a man, that the great crucifix on the St. Sebaldus Church must be suffering dreadful pain, and he entreated to have it taken down. He thought that the balls of the ninepin alley ran their course voluntarily; that they hurt the other balls when they knocked against them; and that when they stopped they were tired. To animals he for long ascribed the same properties as to men; appearing to distinguish them only by the difference of external form. He was angry with a cat for taking its food only with its mouth, and not using its paws as he did his hands. If it was replied that such things could not be expected from animals, his answer was immediately ready, that they ought to learn, as he had been obliged to learn. But one thing in which he differed from a child was his habit of intense attention when taught or shown anything. The poor lad seemed quickly to realize, that he had no time to lose, and evidently never compared himself in this respect with real children, but with persons of his own size and age. Nor did he ever show the shyness of a child. Though his importunate visitors tired and interrupted him, yet they inspired him with no timidity, and, unless required, he took no notice of them.

The thirst for knowledge and the inflexible perseverance, with which he concentrated his attention on anything he determined to learn, were such, we are told, as only those can conceive who witnessed it. This eagerness to recover that of which he had been defrauded was truly affecting; and, after a while, the thought never seemed absent from him.

One of Professor Daumer's most difficult tasks was to induce him to take other food than that of bread only. It was stated at first that while in the tower he had eaten the prison common fare, consisting partly of meat; but it came out afterwards that the prisoner in the same cell with him—a butcher's boy—had willingly dispatched what Kaspar had left untouched. This change could only be carried out with great caution. The bread he had hitherto lived upon was made of rye—that black bread to which in Germany the term 'bread' is alone applied. An accident discovered that it had been spiced with caraway seeds and fennel; again affording a slight clue to the past. In due time he took to various forms of 'Mehl Speisen,' or flour food, and by degrees even the aversion to meat was overcome. Professor Daumer has recorded that, after Kaspar had learned to eat some meat, his mental activity diminished, and his ardent application declined. This he attributed to the effect of animal food. It is far more probable that other causes intervened, and that

that the sudden growth of two inches within a few weeks accounted for the slackening of mental power.

Of the beauties of nature, and generally speaking of the works of God, he had of course no comprehension; nor did they interest him otherwise than by exciting the invariable question, 'Who made those things?' On seeing a rainbow for the first time it gave him momentary pleasure, but soon the reiterated question 'Who made it?' interested him more than the rainbow itself.

It was while under the shelter of a kind, domestic home, that the consciousness of his unhappy fate seemed to open more and more upon him; it was first there that the sacred ties of family life were made known to him. This depression and excitability became so great that his feeble strength threatened to give way, and as exercise was absolutely necessary, the faculty of Nuremberg prescribed that of riding. The riding-master at Nuremberg, who, like everybody else there, knew him, accordingly made him free to enter his *manège*.

Kaspar Hauser was now so far advanced from the utterly negative condition in which he had been found, as to show indications of individual character. And this character was one of no ordinary kind. From the first he evinced a nature of singular gentleness and humanity. He could not bear to hurt a fly. He was docile, and perfectly obedient, and beautifully truthful. His habits were from the first scrupulously orderly. The regiment of toys accumulated by degrees round him were carefully put by at night, and arranged in fresh order in the morning. Child as he was, he had no childish deceit or tricks; on the contrary, as far as his slender powers of expression permitted, he is represented to have shown an almost exaggerated love of justice. One thing of course was wanting, namely, the conception of anything above this world, or beyond this life. Nor, as we have said, could there have been anything more ill-judged than the way in which his first teachers had attempted to supply this void. In his ideas of a God, as in other lower things, he followed the usual instinct of childhood, embarrassing his friends with artless questions about God, just as children do us. Once, when his instructor was dwelling on the omnipotence of the Deity, he went beyond the instincts of childhood, and asked, in sad sarcasm on his own fate, 'Can Almighty God also make time go back?' By degrees we are told, it was given to him to grasp the idea of a great and good Maker and Ruler of all things, and to regard His commands as just and His will as supreme; but all notions of redemption and atonement, and, in short, of that Saviour whose love and pity this apparently sinned-against child so especially claimed, probably



probably owing to the manner in which they had been first thrust upon him, failed to reach his mind.

The judicious kindness he received in Professor Daumer's family, and the enjoyment of horse exercise, soon showed their result in his improved health. He made progress in general knowledge, and especially in reading and writing, so as to yield to the desire of his friends, that he should collect his recollections into a species of memoir for the public. This was in the summer of 1829, rather more than a year after his first appearance. Accordingly it soon became known—being reported in several journals—that Kaspar Hauser was writing his own life. It is reasonable to believe that this announcement aroused those hidden forces, which seemed to have ruled his destiny, but which had hitherto kept concealed from view. The little child, to whom all but life had been denied, who for some reason was not killed, and who showed no signs of dying, had, as time advanced, become a possible source of embarrassment. This had been obviated by exposing him in a public street. But if his actual disappearance, beneath the great wave of that new life into which he had been cast, had been really expected, the invisible agents were now undeceived. The sequel proved that his movements had been watched, and that his residence with Professor Daumer was known. It was on the 17th of October, 1829, that at the primitive hour of dinner—12 o'clock—the lad was missing. Search being made for him, copious traces of blood were found on staircase, passage, and other lower parts of the house, all leading to a cellar, entered by a door flat with the ground. On lifting this he was seen lying at the further end, bleeding, and apparently dying. On being brought up, he showed signs of life, his first words being 'Man! man!' after which he was seized with paroxysms of shivering, and then with a kind of frenzy, in which several persons were scarcely able to restrain him. The next forty-eight hours were spent in delirium, in which the idea of the Man, his former keeper, and of his being attacked by him, took the lead. The wound was on the forehead, evidently inflicted by a sharp instrument. It was believed to have been intended for the throat, but averted, by a rapid bend of the head, to the forehead. The flow of blood had been considerable, otherwise the injury was not grave, but in the patient's highly nervous condition it was some weeks before he recovered. His own account was that he had gone into the lower part of the house, when he saw a man stealing along the passage. The man's head was entirely black, and he believed him to be a chimney-sweep, who on a former occasion had frightened him. Suddenly the figure attacked him. He

could not see his assailant's face, and thought he had a black covering over his whole head; but, for all that, he was sure it was 'the Man.' In his terror he ran upstairs, and, not finding any one, ran down again and took refuge in the cellar.

This event created an enormous sensation in the town, and judicial enquiries are stated to have been set on foot; though the mystery in which they were shrouded, and the pedantry of German forms, were not calculated to inspire confidence as to results. But the first feeling was a natural anxiety as to Kaspar's safety, and as soon as he was sufficiently recovered he was removed from the house of Professor Daumer to that of one of the magistrates. Here for some time he was carefully guarded and not allowed to leave the house without the escort of two of the police. In June 1830, he was again moved, and this time to the care of a Herr von Tücher, who was formally appointed his guardian. The town authorities had now in a legal document recognized the mysterious foundling as their charge, and bound themselves not to deliver him to any one, except on proof of legitimate claim. The poor lad had meanwhile secured a powerful friend and patron in the person of Herr von Feuerbach, an old and eminent jurist, residing at Ansbach. He had carefully studied the case, and his work entitled '*Kaspar Hauser—the account of an individual kept in a dungeon, and separated from all communication with the world, from early childhood to about the age of seventeen—drawn up from legal documents, 1832*,' is the most intelligent we possess; and, though enthusiastically interested in its object, yet bearing the stamp of that careful observation from life which is the pledge of truth. The above work tells us that, although orderly and gentle in manner, yet, that if first seen without being known, he would strike every one by his unready speech, and his awkward and unpliant movements, as 'a strange phenomenon,' 'a mingled compound of child, youth, and man, in whom it seems impossible, at the first glance, to determine to which of these three ages this prepossessing combination of them all properly belongs.'

'The face,' he adds, 'presents a union of the tender traits of childhood, and the harsher lines of manhood—expressing by turns a heart-winning sweetness, with a tinge of melancholy—a confidential openness, and a more than childish inexperience. In his mind there appears nothing of genius, not even any remarkable talent. What he now learns he owes to perseverance, but the zest, with which at first he seemed anxious to learn all things, has long been extinguished. In every study he undertakes he soon remains stationary. Without a spark of fancy, incapable of uttering a single pleasantry, or even of understanding a figurative expression, he possesses dry, but sound

common-sense.

common-sense. In understanding a man, in knowledge of any kind a little child, and in many respects more ignorant still than a child, he often utters things which, coming from any other person of the same age would be stupid and silly, but which from him always force from us a smile of sad compassion.'

Such words as these go further in vindication of this story than pages of description. If a great dramatist had ever attempted to invent such a character, he would have personated it in a mixture of childishness and sadness, the natural childishness of the one age, and the equally natural sadness of the other. Other touches by Herr von Feuerbach heighten the pathos. Alluding to criticisms already murmuring, and forestalling others that became far louder, he remarks; 'too old to be considered a child, and too ignorant to be regarded as a man, without country, parent, or relations, reminded every moment in the bustle of the world of his weakness, and especially of his dependence, he is, as it were, the only creature of his kind. Hence the expertness and acuteness, which some call slyness and cunning, with which he seizes the peculiarities and foibles of others, and knows how to accommodate himself to those who are able to do him good or harm.' The piteous side of his unnatural fate is further told by the clouds of grief which overhang his brow, and frequently pour themselves forth in tears and lamentations. Nor will it be possible ever to comfort him entirely respecting his fate. The final observations of Herr von Feuerbach are thus summed up:—

'The extraordinary acuteness of his senses has subsided to almost the common level. He indeed still sees in the dark, so that night is only twilight for him, but he can no longer read in the dark, nor recognize, as he once did, the most minute objects at a distance. Like other men he now bears and loves the light of the sun, which no longer distresses his eyes. Of the gigantic powers of his memory and other astonishing qualities, not a trace remains. He no longer retains anything that is extraordinary, but his indescribable goodness, the exceeding amiability of his disposition, and his extraordinary fate.'

By this time a great change had come over Kaspar Hauser's prospects. This change was owing to the appearance of Earl Stanhope on the scene, father of the historian. This eccentric nobleman visited Nuremberg in May 1831. Having indulged the curiosity felt by all visitors to see what was then considered the most extraordinary sight the town afforded, he immediately conceived the most ardent interest in Kaspar, and declared his wish to adopt him, and to take him to England. Despite the pledge given not to make him over

to any one, except on proof of legitimate claim, the authorities of Nuremberg at once acceded to the wish of the Earl, whose rank and wealth were novelties of no common kind in that old-fashioned part of the world. At the same time, this transfer did not take place without every formal guarantee for his welfare that the legal courts of Bavaria could supply. It is no wonder that the fact of an English nobleman, ready to throw the ægis of his protection over the forlorn young man, should have excited sentiments of romantic admiration, in which the King of Bavaria, old Ludwig of eccentric fame, led the way with an autograph letter of acknowledgement to the Earl.

There was another side, however, to this delightful picture. The Earl, as might have been foreseen, did not prove the most judicious of foster-fathers. He gave the lad sumptuous presents, and an amount of money of which he was yet far from knowing the legitimate use. He treated him alternately with the homage due to a man, the undoubted offspring of some great princely family, or with the familiar caresses and foolish indulgence suited only to a child. At last, his guardian, Herr v. Tücher, evidently a man of sense and honour, after remonstrating in vain with the Earl, both by word and letter, felt compelled to throw up his charge. Lord Stanhope now (December 1831) removed Kaspar to Ansbach, and placed him in the house of a teacher of the name of Meyer. There is no reason to doubt that the choice of this gentleman was judicious, but it is easy to see that a position of responsibility towards two such strange characters was no enviable one. The relations between the English peer and the poor Foundling were an anomaly in the eyes even of the gushing Germans. They embraced when they met, and they wept when they parted; and the Earl on his way to England wrote to the lad from every station. Kaspar, in the sight of those to whom his education was confided, was the heir to great fortunes, and, like all heirs apparent, was an embarrassing charge. And by this time the part played by Lord Stanhope had exercised that demoralizing effect upon the poor half-formed lad that was to be expected. It was not all the foster-father's fault. The extraordinary interest which Kaspar's case excited, the incredible personal attention that attended him everywhere, was enough to turn any young head. Told over and over again that he was the most remarkable and interesting young man in the world, and invited to the first houses, he would sit as the chief guest; while the other guests, who thought it a favour to be asked to meet him, recounted his own story before him, touching it up with explanations and elucidations, and ransacking the genealogy of the reigning Houses in order

order to find some vacancy they thought likely to suit him. This prestige was further kept up by his natural gentleness, and even abstinence, which gave a certain charm and propriety to his manner. All this, which now culminated in the weak and doating fondness of an English nobleman, could hardly fail to develop a vanity and wilfulness which by degrees became rampant. Nor is it surprising to hear that a want of truth and a habit of secretiveness and suspicion were in turn added. He showed at length all the faults of the most carefully and curiously spoilt child, and finally, and as a matter of course, there failed not that strong, indigenous vice, which flourishes most where benefits most abound, that saddest symptom of poor human nature—ingratitude! He ignored his former benefactors; never speaking of them, nor caring to hear of them. Kaspar had now outgrown that halo of romance and tenderness with which ‘the Child of Nuremberg’ had been invested. He was in a new place and under new circumstances; the stricter nature of which showed him in a less pleasing aspect; while there is no doubt that the very prospect before him, probably greatly exaggerated in splendour, rendered him the object of unsparing scrutiny, and of considerable envy. From this time, at all events, the tide of prejudice began to set against him. Lord Stanhope himself, instead of returning to Ansbach for him, or empowering some one to convey him to England, began to ask categorical questions with regard to his industry and intellectual progress. Truths which, however natural, were rather disappointing, now came out. Herr Meyer and his other teachers frankly owned that, on coming to Ansbach, he was altogether not forwarder than a boy of eight or nine, and that, instead of desiring to improve, he was full of excuses to avoid all application.

Meanwhile the uncertainty of Lord Stanhope’s movements continued to exercise the patience of Herr Meyer and the other sponsors. This was not from any lack of liberality, for the Earl spared nothing, whether for the lad’s worldly advantage, or for the elucidation of his fate; but month after month, and half year after half year went by, and nothing was heard of his intentions. Kaspar’s guardians therefore felt it high time to prepare him for some mode of earning his bread—for one of Lord Stanhope’s questions referred especially to what he was fit for—and, with Kaspar’s own concurrence, they placed him in the lowest class of clerkships in a Government Chancery in Ansbach, where little beyond a boy’s first handwriting was required.

We have alluded to gleams of evidence which seemed to crop  
up

up from time to time. An idea, for instance, had arisen that Kaspar's origin was to be found in Hungary. Accordingly a young man who understood Hungarian was admitted to him, accompanied by two of his friends, when, after purposely speaking of indifferent things, he suddenly repeated the Hungarian words for 'one, two, three.' Kaspar immediately showed signs of excitement. Other words were uttered, with the same effect. This was sufficient to induce Lord Stanhope, who has been unjustly accused of frustrating the pursuit of this clue, to send Herr v. Tücher and another, with the lad himself, all travelling under feigned names, direct to Hungary, to institute private enquiry. The friends were further directed quietly to watch what impression the sound of Hungarian speech and the sight of the costumes made on him. The result was that no impression whatever, from either cause, was observable. The journey, however, and the talk about it which ensued, sufficed to spread the belief, that he was come of some great Hungarian house. At the same time this discovery ran counter to another favoured idea, which was that he was one of the Baden princes, sons of Stephanie, hitherto believed to have died in infancy; the eldest of whom was known to have been born in 1812, Kaspar's own reputed birth-year. This idea was strengthened by the distress notoriously known to have been suffered by the Grand Duchess at the mere supposition, which was, however, proved eventually to be without a shred of foundation.

Another idea, to which importance was attached, was occasioned by a vague sense of recognition exhibited by Kaspar on first being taken to the 'Burg,' or castle, at Nuremberg, when the grand staircase, the folding doors, like none he had seen before, and the long suite of rooms after the fashion of all German palaces, seemed to touch chords of memory, and roused indistinct images of a time when he lived in such a place, and was attended, Miranda-like, by several female servants.

It was after these barren results, and perhaps in consequence of them, that Lord Stanhope sent the guardians a series of thirty questions bearing on points of Kaspar's reputed history, and especially on the attempt at assassination in October 1829. No change, however, took place in the provision made by the Earl for the comfort and pleasure of his adopted son. He continued to travel, under due escort, from time to time, and was presented to various great personages desirous to know him. On one occasion, passing through Bamberg, where he appeared at a ball, the anxiety to see the mysterious lad produced quite a public commotion.

Still, though he thus continued to excite the same curiosity

as ever—some worthy Germans even seriously persisting in calling him ‘My lord!’—there was evidently an increasing tension between him and those to whom he was consigned: he knew that they had lost trust in him, and they gave him to understand that Lord Stanhope had done the same; at the same time, on his own part, he was never open with them, and neglected his light duties at the Chancery under excuses as false as they were frequent. In short there was a feeling, as if this condition of things could not continue long, as if a crisis of some kind were at hand. And a crisis was at hand, though in a most unforeseen form.

In the afternoon of the 14th December (1833), Herr Meyer was sitting in his room, when the door suddenly burst open, and Kaspar appeared, and with wild gestures, and in broken words gave him to understand that he had been stabbed. ‘The Man—had a knife—“Uz” monument—gave me a purse, and then stabbed me. I ran as fast as I could. Purse left lying there.’ He was put to bed without delay. Notice was given of the attack, and a policeman sent to the spot Kaspar had described, where he found a little lilac silk purse. It contained only a scrap of paper, on which were written in pencil characters the following lines: ‘To be delivered. Hauser will be able to tell you exactly who I am, and whence I come, but in order to spare him the trouble, I will tell you myself:—

‘I come from  
The Bavarian frontier  
By the river,  
I will even tell you my name—M. L. Oe.’

This purse was made over to the town officials, who with two doctors immediately met by the bedside to inspect the wound and obtain and issue a description of the assassin—an object which the state of the patient at first only imperfectly permitted. On the left side of the breast was a small but deep wound. The corresponding cut was seen through wadded coat, waistcoat, frontpiece, and shirt. Meanwhile snow had fallen continuously, and the number of people, who, on the incident spreading like lightning through the town, had at once rushed to the monument, had obliterated all distinctive footmarks. Nor was there a trace of the weapon to be found. On the 15th, unfavourable symptoms forbade examination. On the 16th he was much better, and was questioned. His deposition was continued at three different intervals, and amounted to this: that on the 11th of the month he had been accosted at the foot of the steps leading to the Court of Appeal, at 9 o'clock A.M., by a man



man looking like a workman, who said, 'The Court Gardener sends you his best compliments, and begs you to come a little after three to the Court Gardens, when he will show you the different clays to be seen in sinking the artesian well.' He did not go that day because it was wet, but he told Frau v. Heckel, a friend's wife, about it, who begged him not to go. On the 14th of December the same man appeared again at the same place and time, and repeated the invitation. The report of this examination was fully given, helping to fill up and also to account for the forty-two large volumes of official documents relating to this mysterious person. But for the formality with which these are given, the irrelevancy of the chief questions would not be credited. He was asked—dying as he was—the colour of his assassin's eyes, moustache, and hair; what sort of trowsers he wore; what was the character of his voice, and what dialect he spoke. The report he gave of his own proceedings was simple. He went into the Court Gardens at the hour appointed, and straight to the artesian well. Finding no one there, he went on to the Uz monument; and there, at the two stone seats, a tall man suddenly came forward, gave him a purse, and immediately stabbed him. He then let the purse fall, and ran home as fast as he could. He was shown the purse, which he thought was the same. Asked why, considering the attack on him at Nuremberg, he ventured to obey a summons from an unknown man to a lonely spot? answered that he had not thought himself in danger now that he had a foster-father. This was the upshot of forty-two questions!

On the 17th the symptoms became alarming. They still continued to ask him questions, but his answers were rambling, though all are printed. The same evening this forlorn being, whose life and death were alike enveloped in mystery, passed peacefully away. A reward of 800*l.*—no slight sum in Germany—was offered by the Government for the detection of the murderer, to which Lord Stanhope added 400*l.* more, but time passed on without eliciting the slightest track.

We have said that the tide of prejudice had begun to set strongly against him, murmurs of which had even reached the dying man himself. The catastrophe of his violent death gave them a louder voice, and a more definite object, namely, in the question whether he died by his own hand or by that of another. The depositions regarding his last days must here be referred to. Herr Meyer and his wife both deposed that, for the last week or so, they thought he had been more reserved, and had withdrawn more from their society than usual—certainly that he had also had less appetite; and on the 14th he ate so  
little

little that Frau Meyer expostulated. In the last week also he was even more than usually reluctant to work, leaving the Court of Appeal daily an hour before his time, under the pretext that he had a lesson to attend. This was not true. Also on the 14th he went to a friend's house and stayed there till nearly three o'clock, when he left, saying he had to attend an appointment. This was also not true. Further, he must have known, that the boring of the artesian well had ceased in the month of August. Finally, the Court Gardener deposed that he had never sent him such a message as he had reported. All these instances of dissimulation tended to strengthen the belief in suicide. It may be added that it was afterwards discovered, that he had put his little possessions in his room carefully in order, and had destroyed papers which had been seen in his keeping a few days before.

A second question mooted was whether he had intended suicide, or only such a wound—as in the case of the reported attack on him in Nuremberg, the belief in which, of course, now shared the same doubts—as would excite interest and help to revive his waning reputation. This question was solved by the wound itself, the doctors all agreeing that the blow was one which, whosoever the hand, was meant to deal death. The direction of the wound was oblique, and from left to right. This was adverse to the supposition of suicide, till it was remembered that Kaspar Hauser was left-handed. A seated position also would have further facilitated the act, and here there were two stone seats at hand. On the other hand, those bent on suicide usually bare the breast to the blow; here the wound went through a great thickness of winter clothing.

One of the doctors gave the committee the benefit of his experience as to the difference of demeanour, after the act, between one wounded, mortally or not, by another hand, and one wounded by his own. That those, namely, wounded by another are anxious as to their own state; frequently asking questions as to the nature of their wounds; while those who have intended suicide are generally quiet, self-absorbed, and indifferent as to the nature of their wounds. Kaspar Hauser's demeanour was of this last class.

The point that puzzled them most was that a man so mortally wounded should have been able—and he was seen by several on the way—to run the considerable distance between the Monument and his home. The question of the weapon was another puzzle. Whether at Ansbach or at Nuremberg, Kaspar, by the nature of his semi-public and strictly supervised life, could not possibly have obtained such a weapon without all the small world  
of

of either place ringing with the fact. Its concealment after the deed was not such a mystery, for the river Rezat runs through the Court Gardens. Finally the fact of the small lilac silk purse, of no small significance in the enquiry, remained absolutely unexplained. Some thought they had seen it before in Kaspar's own possession, and even that the writing resembled his own. This last idea was promptly negatived by 'experts.' One thing was certain, that the contents of the paper were marked by the same brutal rhodomontade that characterized the letter to the Captain; while another equally certain point was, that its grim humour was utterly beyond the power of Kaspar to invent: at the same time the unavoidable inference is plain, that the admission of any accomplice in the deed at once dismisses the idea of suicide. The following inscription, therefore, on a stone, placed at the spot where the blow was supposed to be struck, embodies the only conclusion to which all the investigations led:—

'Hic  
Occultus  
Occulto  
Occisus est  
XIV. Dec.  
MDCCCXXXIII.'

The question of Kaspar Hauser's suicide immediately opened that of his entire history. This, though in some sense natural, was in no sense logical. The two questions had no real connexion. Suicide is based upon conditions common to a small percentage of the human race; Kaspar's reputed condition was one in which he stood alone. We shall be reminded that, in thus supposing his extraordinary history to be true, we virtually abandon the necessity for all proof. But that is very different from abandoning the existence of proof; of which we maintain that there is plenty. Granting, as the reader must have observed, that the narrative is encumbered with contradictions, inconsistencies, and gross improbabilities, yet all these, proved ten times over to be such, do not touch the main fact. Indeed, it may be said, taking all into account that, if there were not inconsistencies in such a narrative, we should the more doubt it to be true. It was easy to discover that Kaspar blundered in what he said, or rather in what people believed that he said, for all received a finish from the conjectures of others, but no one discovered that he blundered in the part he had assumed. It was the man himself who was the evidence, and all abstract doubt, founded on the improbability of the story, was sure to collapse at once before ten minutes contact with its subject.

Among

Among the numerous works in which the pros and cons of this case are argued, one by Merker, the head of the police at Berlin, is the most able. It is a very Handbook for the detection of imposture; but it lacks the real touchstone, for he never saw Kaspar.

We have told his history, since his first appearance in Nuremberg, in the earlier part of this article, as it was told at the time to the public, and have told it purposely uncritically. With the doubt cast on it by several works contemporary and recent, the time is come to apply to it such criticism as can be commanded. Great stress is naturally laid on the evidence of those to whom the lad first appeared. Witnesses were examined on oath on two different occasions, the earliest being in November, 1829, the latest in May, 1834. Considering the lapse of time, the one occasion a year and a half after the event, the other six years after, it would be strange if they had not contradicted not only one another, but themselves. The questions most needing answers were, first, how a youth so long immured in one position was able to use his feet; and secondly, how he looked. The shoemaker, who first saw him, deposed on the first occasion that he came staggering (*'wackelnd'*) along, and on the second, that he walked with 'firm strong steps;' while the servant at the Captain's house stated that he evinced great suffering, and could hardly use his feet. As regards his looks, one policeman deposed that he had a healthy colour, as if he had lived in the air, while another swore that he was pale, and looked as if he had been long shut up. Sheets of evidence were filled, all contributing to make up the forty-two volumes, from which no other conclusion can be drawn except the absurdity of evidence taken under such conditions.

On the other hand the deposition of Hiltel, the gaoler, bears all the stamp of intelligence and truth. He deposed that Kaspar, on arriving, was so exhausted that he had to be helped upstairs; that he repeated the same words *'Reuta wahn,'* &c., in season and out of season, like a parrot; called every animal *'Ross'*; had no idea of day and night, or of sun and moon; and showed his ignorance of fire by putting his hand, on the second day, into the flame of a lighted splinter. Hiltel added in 1834, that Kaspar had a good understanding, and was so amiable and docile that, 'had I not had eight children of my own, I should not have parted with him.' That the police had directed him to watch him closely, which he did; adding his firm conviction, that there was no deceit about him; and that it was perfectly impossible that he could have kept up such a part, if part it could be called, the only art of which consisted in  
pretending

pretending to be as stupid and childish as he really was. And it must be borne in mind that the gaoler was the man best fitted in all Nuremberg to detect imposture. During that time also Kaspar was visited and talked to by hundreds, without the idea of imposture being so much as surmised. It is true most of these hundreds were not very wise, many of them much the reverse; but they were wise enough to perceive that he was what he seemed. They would indeed have as soon believed black to be white, as that the poor nondescript, whom they gaped at and played tricks on, was all the while playing far deeper tricks on them.

This is so extraordinary a story that, unless we keep hold of certain facts, we lose ourselves in such a tangle as to be tempted to cut the knot by disbelieving the whole thing. There lie immediately on the surface a whole group of improbabilities; the place of his confinement, the nocturnal visits of 'the Man' who brought his food, the drugging of the water, the being taught to walk in a place where he could not stand upright, and to write where his teacher could not see, the description of the journey, &c. But none of these incidents, even admitting his imperfect powers of description, are really so improbable as that he should successfully feign the part of an innocent child, at once so difficult to assume, and so easy to detect, that he should further have been able to imitate or even to know the symptoms of an occult element in Nature, Magnetism, the very existence of which he could by no possibility have known. Nor can all these improbabilities neutralize for a moment the evidence of the state of his saliva, the result of the long and sole consumption of the gelatinous properties of a bread and water diet, nor, as little, the material fact of the malformation of his knees, diagnosed by an eminent surgeon of the time, and induced by the long continuance of one position. And lastly, and still less, can the whole group of improbabilities outweigh a proof of truth which cried aloud from Death itself. For the examination of the body divulged an enormously enlarged condition of the liver, so large as to encroach on the heart, which the doctors of Ansbach could only attribute to a seated posture kept up for years; in other words, to that total privation of all natural exercise, the effect of which was also seen in the undeveloped size of the lungs. The case of this strange being would appear indeed to have been far less adapted for the scrutiny of lawyers and constables, and both had ample opportunities to study it, than for that of persons of sound sense and close observation; bearing always in mind the youth of the subject, his utter ignorance of the commonest things

things in this world, and the confusion sure to ensue from the unequal match between him and his interlocutors; misunderstanding on their part being quite as natural as misstatement on his.

Something, too, must be laid to the account of the well-meant exaggeration on the part of his friends, who, in their ardour to catch at any shred of a clue, were tempted to try and heighten the interest of certain indications, such, for instance, as his love for horses; shown first by his toys, and further confirmed by the inspired manner in which he was described to have at once mounted the animal, and in a few days performed as wonderful feats of horsemanship as the riding-master himself: all pointing to an aristocracy of birth in which such tastes and powers were inherent. Unfortunately for this ingenious theory, it at once gave way before the deposition of the riding-master in question, which states that far from showing any dexterity in horsemanship, Kaspar Hauser had to be lifted on to the animal, with difficulty kept his seat, and could not be said to be a rider in any sense. The riding-master further expressed his annoyance that such a fable should have been published, one far less consistent with his reputed antecedents than the simple truth.

It is a curious feature in this short history of this strange being that, in the first months of his appearance, he gave a far higher promise of power and ability than he subsequently fulfilled. His memory, as we have said, was extraordinary, his thirst for knowledge insatiable. Herr von Tücher found nothing to reprove in him but his over-anxiety to learn. Before that gentleman gave up his charge, he had cause to reprove him for the opposite extreme. This change was attributed, by a not very sagacious process of reasoning, to his having learned to eat meat. One of the doctors who attended the 'post mortem,' gives a more philosophical explanation. The skull was rather low, in his words, 'as if pressed together downwards,' and the brain, though normal, was small, and not particularly delicate in its structure; even, he said, somewhat brutish. Altogether, there were signs which indicated a deficient development of the organ, suggesting the belief, that the brain had been arrested in its development by lack of stimulus and action. For it is, as we all know, a law in Nature that no organ which remains unused attains perfection, or, having attained it, retains it; but, on the contrary, declines, and gradually wastes away. By about seven years of age the allotted development of the brain is accomplished. But if before that time its progress has been, from any cause, cut short, it remains stationary both in a mental  
and

and material sense, a state which no after opportunities can rectify. The rapid intellectual advance made by Kaspar Hauser in his first year or so, though only the relative advance of a child, proved that the brain was so far matured; but its arrest at that point, and speedy decline from it, showed that it could advance no further.

Finally, we must make that first and last question in all such cases, what interest he had in practising so extraordinary a deceit? if deceit there was. And perhaps the greatest proof, negative, it is true, but strong, that no deceit was practised, is, that no rational or credible answer can be given. Where there are no precedents, there are no rules. Other impostors have objects to seek, and schemes to pursue. Poor Kaspar Hauser wished for nothing but dry bread and water! His daily diet for long cost Professor Daumer, or rather the town, only six kreutzers, or twopence a day; and he was with the greatest reluctance gradually induced to add to his bill of fare. Nothing ever induced him to change his beverage. There was no plan, no plausibility, no pretensions. He was very unhappy in a world in which he could do nothing like other men, and, if he attained a marvellous and most troublesome notoriety, it was what he could not possibly have foreseen.

The change in his general intelligence, and the deterioration which for obvious reasons had taken place in his moral nature, were coincident in time; and with them ceased, in great measure, the interest with which the local public regarded him. This was to be expected; but what may be legitimately set aside is the idea that his vanity, want of veracity, and signs of temper, were proofs of his being an impostor. Altogether it was time for poor Kaspar Hauser to die! The so pathetically engaging lad, whom v. Feuerbach had described as 'my dear, marvellous, puzzling foundling, for long the first and most important object of my solicitude, observation, and care'—whom v. Tücher describes as 'an innocent child, of the purest and most spotless soul, knowing no evil—a *tabula rasa*, with endless powers of receptivity'—this interesting being had disappeared, and given place to a man of untruthful and secretive habits—only too easily contracted under the circumstances that had surrounded him—before whom lay an ever more and more darkening future—who felt that his prestige was gone, who was alone of his kind, and who knew that he could never support himself. His death was the signal for all his worldly friends to throw stones, Lord Stanhope throwing the heaviest in his German work, 'Materials for a History of Kaspar Hauser.' Happily for the credit of human nature, a touching contrast to this



this ugly picture was shown in the affectionate zeal with which his best and earliest friends took up his defence.

We have thus endeavoured to extract an impartial statement of this unprecedented case, from the numerous works in which it has been discussed with equal warmth on both sides. Strange that its truth or falsity should still be left to the conflicting voice of Opinion! not a single fact having come to light to place either on a firmer basis. Nearly two generations have now passed away since this poor waif appeared on the scene, and it is still as difficult as ever to decide whether he was the actor of an iniquitous imposture, or the victim of an unheard of crime. Considered as an imposture, it is extraordinary that it should have succeeded; considered as a mystery, it is equally extraordinary that it could have been maintained. Two arguments may be urged which may incline others, as they have inclined us, to believe rather in the crime than in the imposture. The first, that only such a fate as his could have produced a Kaspar Hauser; the second, that it is easier to believe his story than his power to impersonate it. He must now be left alone with his secret, best expressed by the epitaph on his tombstone:

‘Hic jacet  
CASPARUS HAUSER  
Ænigma  
Sui temporis  
Ignota nativitas  
Occulta mors.  
M.D.CCCXXXIII.’

---

ART. VIII.—1. *The West Indies; or, the Bow of Ulysses.* By James A. Froude. London, 1888.

2. *Speech by the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour at Stalybridge,* March 24th, 1888.

IT was in the month of December, 1886, that Mr. Froude left England for the West Indies, in quest of information which he has now published to the world in so agreeable and interesting a form. As he was borne rapidly along through the snow-covered fields and woods of Surrey and Hampshire, on his way to Southampton, he found his newspapers full of Lord Tennyson's new poem, the sequel to *Locksley Hall*; and among other remarks which he makes upon the subject, he says this at all events is clear, that 'things which Lord Tennyson had despised in his youth, he saw now that he had been mistaken in despising.' Whatever we may think of the authority of Lord Tennyson or Mr. Froude, in particular, the words themselves point a moral for us all, pregnant with instruction, if we will only condescend to profit by it. But in order to follow up with advantage the general train of thought which it awakens, we must carry with us the impressions left on Mr. Froude's mind by the condition of the West Indies in particular, as they lead up naturally to that wider survey of our present political position which the words above quoted are calculated to suggest.

What Mr. Froude saw, or seemed to see, in the plight of our West Indian Colonies, was the enervating effect of modern Liberalism. The principle has its good side, but, as Falstaff says, 'it was always yet the trick of our English nation, if they have a good thing, to make it too common,' and so has it been with Liberalism, and many of the popular ideas which it embodies. In former times the West Indian Planters constituted a governing class, and ruled the islands as an English garrison, much as the Anglo-Irish gentry formerly ruled Ireland. They were a real aristocracy, voluptuous, perhaps, and indolent, and uninfluenced, it may be, by any very lofty conceptions of life or duty, but kind masters, and decidedly popular with their slaves, who, whatever the evils of slavery, experienced them in a milder form than they would have done in Dahomey or Ashantee. But the islands, be it remembered, were never peopled by the English Colonists, dispossessing the former inhabitants, and becoming themselves the national population. Our countrymen remained always the dominant and separate minority, never intermingling with the negroes, or losing the characteristic of the conquering race. Under this system, however, the blacks were happy and  
contented,

contented, for few of the worst abuses of slavery seemed to have prevailed in the West Indies; and at all events they were governed, kept in order, and well cared for, and led lives less brutal and degraded than if they had been left entirely to themselves, as they are now in the Island of Hayti, which has relapsed into cannibalism.

The abolition of slavery, followed by free trade, completed the destruction of the old system, and then, in Mr. Froude's opinion, the mother country should have stepped in and set up a new paternal government in the place of the Planters, whom her policy had ruined. Instead of this, nothing would do but the introduction of representative institutions, the enfranchisement of the negroes, and the erection of a miserable mockery of the British Constitution among a race of beings, infinitely less fit for it than the Hindoos and Mahometans of Asia. Mr. Froude seems to attribute this mistake mainly to that dread of responsibility on the part of the Central Government, of which of late years we have seen so many instances at home, and which is most unquestionably due to that growing interference of the House of Commons with every function of government and every department of policy, which is one of the boasts of Liberalism. But the paralysing influence of this wretched system is not all that is to blame for the spectacle now presented to us in some of the West India Islands: for it is not yet universal. There is a positive as well as a negative cause to assign for it: and that is the insane idea really and honestly entertained by large masses of Englishmen, that representative government is a specific for all diseases, political or social, in all climates, among all races, and under all historical or geographical conditions. On the glorious and ennobling effects of self-government we are lectured *ad nauseam*. Yet it is certain that the vast majority of mankind have not been fit for it in the past, are not fit for it at present, and hold out small promise of becoming so in the future. The consequences of its being generally introduced into the West Indies are, in Mr. Froude's opinion, not doubtful. The whites would retire from the stage, and leave the islands to the negroes, to be speedily converted into scenes of abomination, which humanity would be unable to tolerate. Some great Power—which it is needless to say would not be England—would then have to save them from themselves, and place them once more under some form of government better suited to the negro character, than the ridiculous parody of Parliamentary Institutions, which England has bestowed on some of them, and is likely to extend to all. Mr. Froude would make Crown Colonies of the

whole number, and have them ruled exclusively by English governors, chosen for their capacity, and not for their Parliamentary interest, and unhampered by the machinery of popular assemblies, which the people do not want, do not understand, and can only use for purposes of mischief.

In this very brief and very condensed summary of Mr. Froude's ideas we do not believe, that we have stated anything inaccurately. Of course a vast deal has been omitted which does not bear upon the immediate subject of this paper. But, as far as the question of good government is concerned, we have, we think, said enough to convey his meaning with sufficient clearness. The principle of self-government in the West Indies, as far as it has gone, has been a total failure. Foolish notions of political equality, and a more ignoble dread of political responsibility, have combined to do the mischief which has been already done. To what quarter can we look for either the will or the power to repair past errors, or arrest the growth of new ones? This is the question which Mr. Froude propounds in the last page of his book, and his answer to it brings us to the threshold of our enquiry whether, namely, good government is any longer possible, not only abroad but at home.

Mr. Froude speaks of our present method of conducting the business of the country as having degenerated into government by faction, which is fast developing into civil war. What he means by this remark, in connection with what has gone before, is this, that no government would be allowed at the present day to inaugurate any such policy as he recommends for the West Indies without its being at once converted into an engine of party warfare, and turned against the Ministry who proposed it without the smallest regard for the welfare of the Colonies, the integrity of the Empire, or the merits of the particular measure which was intended to secure both. Elsewhere, he says, that our mistakes in Ireland were in former times, at all events, honest ones, committed in the sincere hope of benefiting that unhappy country. 'The present enterprize,' *i.e.* Home Rule, 'is the creation of Parliamentary faction.' 'If it had suited their purpose equally well, the leaders of the Radical party would as soon have supported Protestant ascendancy.' So far, Mr. Froude, of the present state of party government.

Bad as the look out may be for Dominica, Trinidad, or Grenada, it is a good deal worse for England, Scotland, and Ireland; and as one step towards averting a danger is to become acquainted with its true nature, and to accustom ourselves to look it in the face, we would ask our readers to consider with some attention the points we are about to lay before them; always

always begging them to bear in mind the warning addressed to Parliament by Lord Beaconsfield, namely, that Parliamentary government depends upon party government, and that the disappearance of the one must be followed, at no long interval, if not by the destruction, at least by the emasculation, of the other. Seeing also that matters have not gone so far but that the Constitution and the Empire may still be rescued from the perils which undoubtedly hang over them; and that certain points of vantage still remain to the Conservative party, from which it is quite possible that they may offer a successful resistance to revolution; we would suggest that those Liberals, who look to them for aid in the future, should do justice to their conduct in the past, and remember that, if their own party had at one time been a little less conceited and short-sighted, the difficulties and dangers with which we are now confronted might have been less appalling than they are.

In considering the question, whether good government is any longer possible, there seem to be three principal factors to be taken into account. First, the dread of responsibility in the Government: secondly, the gradual exhaustion of such questions as are the legitimate objects of party warfare, compelling statesmen to have recourse to others which ought never to be dragged into the arena: and thirdly, the rapid growth of a doctrine which may be called the doctrine of power at any price, now and for some time past acted on, if not openly professed, by eminent political leaders. Of the first we can say little more than we have said already. It is the natural issue of the democratic constitution which we have fastened upon ourselves, and of that reign of political busybodies and Parliamentary Paul Prys, which, however much a Radical statesman may despise them, are too useful instruments for harassing and molesting a government to be discarded or discountenanced. To the second, a few more words may be devoted; but our principal purpose in this article is to call attention to the third, which threatens to accelerate most ominously the effect to be looked for in the long run from the decay of party topics, to precipitate a crisis which might have been deferred for half a century, and in the meantime to make all steady government impossible. The end, of course, must have come at last; and then, no doubt, when there was nothing else to fight about, political antagonism might have assumed that violent and reckless character which is usually the precursor of revolution. But there was no necessity for anticipating the event, as it now seems probable that we shall, by the new doctrine of power at any price, which has recently taken root among us. The dissolution of our present

system may arise, either from the failure of such materials as are necessary for its maintenance, or from the passionate rapacity of individuals refusing such as still remain to us, in favour of more speedy and summary methods of obtaining the objects of their ambition. The latter of the two is what we have immediately to fear. It is now at work before our faces; is an immediate and conspicuous menace, and intelligible to the most cursory observer. Impatience of the slow and gradual revolutions of opinion, by which party once succeeded to party in the offices of government, as the seasons succeed to each other under the silent operations of Nature, combined with the reckless adoption of short cuts to power, no matter how abrupt, violent, or mischievous, by leading statesmen of the day, is fast superseding the old traditions and conventions which have so long ruled the House of Commons, and beginning to recal to men's minds what was the condition of that Assembly rather more than a hundred years ago, after a somewhat similar train of antecedents.

The genesis of party is the rivalry of principles. The corruption of party is the rivalry of persons. These two processes have been going on alternately from the very commencement of civil government. How the one glides into the other has been glanced at in the foregoing observations. As time goes on, the original differences, which first caused the separation of politicians into two hostile camps, are either settled by legislation or shelved by circumstances. They die away and disappear. But the two connections still remain: the vested interests of party still survive; and both sides are reluctant to abandon them. Then begins the process of decay, the birth of that change by which parties degenerate into factions, and self-seeking takes the place of public spirit. We can hardly find a better illustration of our meaning than in the period to which we have referred. All the questions which had divided political parties from the Revolution downwards were settled, for the time at all events, on the accession of George III. Such being the case, the King saw no reason why he should not employ both parties. The succession was no longer in danger. The question of religious disabilities was the shadow of its former self. The Hanoverian system was abandoned. What intelligible line of distinction between Whigs and Tories was any longer left? But there they were. Ancient and inveterate animosities forbade them to coalesce. Every Whig had a vested interest in his party, just as every minister of the Free Kirk in Scotland has a vested interest in the secession, and opposes reunion though the original cause of it has vanished. What happened? First of all came ten years of personal and sectarian conflict,

conflict, of so mean, selfish, and degrading a character, that the nation saw with pleasure the rout of the revolution families, and the Tory Government of Lord North. Then came the time when, furious at finding themselves excluded from that monopoly of power which they conceived to be their right, and seeing no materials for opposition in the old differences of opinion between themselves and the Tories, the Whigs threw themselves desperately into the cause of the American insurgents, though the insurrection had been mainly caused by the Act \* of their own leader, Lord Rockingham; openly proclaimed their sympathy with the King's rebellious subjects, and did not scruple to express their satisfaction at every defeat of the British troops. Whatever the mistakes of the Government, whatever the right of the Whigs to condemn their policy in its inception, they had no right, when the sword had once been drawn, to do all that lay in their power to assist the King's enemies, and contribute to the discomfiture of his arms. This is too plain to need argument, and the country marked its sense of their conduct by ostracizing them for fifty years.

For it is a mistake to suppose, that the triumph of Pitt in 1784 was due exclusively to the events of the preceding year, to the Coalition, and the India Bill. The freeholders of Yorkshire and Leicestershire knew little about either. But they had all alike been anxious to see the American revolt suppressed, and they knew that the action of the Whigs had contributed to its success. The latter party now paid the penalty of their crime. A generation ago men were still living who could remember the surrender of Yorktown as well as any one among us can remember the battle of Waterloo; and could tell of the flame of indignation which ran through the whole country, when it was known that the new Whig Government had recalled Admiral Rodney, because the expedition which he commanded had been planned by the Tories. The order came too late to prevent the glorious victory of the 12th of April; but it was long remembered; for these are the misdeeds which sink into the hearts of nations, and not the machinations of party, or the impolicy of measures, which, before the days of newspapers and railways, made little impression on those not immediately concerned with them. But the violent and passionate conduct of the Whig leaders, and the recklessness with which they had adopted any policy that would help them for the moment against their rivals, however disastrous to the Empire, or unsuitable for party purposes, had brought us to the brink of

---

\* The Declaratory Act.



a revolution, only averted, according to Lord Beaconsfield, by the tremendous storm which soon afterwards broke over the Continent.

The conduct of the Opposition during these early days of George III. was a sign and token, that the legitimate materials of party warfare were exhausted; and that either new parties must be formed, or the system finally abolished. Similar phenomena may justify similar conclusions; and if we see in our own day recourse to the same class of weapons, the same determination to destroy an adversary either by fair means or foul, and the same reckless disregard of the honour and interests of the country in pursuit of these objects, we should ask ourselves whether the consummation which the Whigs so nearly brought about in the last century may not be at hand now, and what steps we ought to take to restore the conditions of good government without being landed at the goal which Lord Beaconsfield discerned in the horizon.

The Whigs repeated during the French war the offence of which they had been guilty in the American war; but in a much milder form, and without any measure of success; and for half a century after the conclusion of the Peace, we enjoyed almost perfect immunity from such tactics. Immense arrears of legislation had accumulated during the eighteenth century, affording ample materials for party controversy, without trenching on the foundations of government. They are not, as we have said, yet exhausted. But the desperate and profligate system, which a hundred years ago nearly led to a change in the Constitution, has again made its appearance among us, and will doubtless do its worst to make all such government, as Mr. Froude now desiderates, impracticable.

We trust we are guilty of no injustice in saying, that the beginning of this new method of warfare dates from the passage of the Conservative Reform Bill in 1867, when it seemed that the Government were about to appeal to the new constituencies with almost the absolute certainty of a large majority in their favour. To counteract this imminent peril, some decisive measure was necessary on the part of the Opposition: and Mr. Gladstone immediately announced the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. Less than two years before, he had declared it not to be within the circle of debateable propositions; and the flimsy pretence, that the attempt on Clerkenwell prison had altered his opinion in a moment, deceived nobody. Of the Irish Church question itself we say nothing. What we say is, that a great political leader, reduced to sudden despair by the prospect of a long exclusion from power, hastily snatched  
up

up the first weapon that came to hand, in the shape of an ecclesiastical revolution, wherewith to brain his rival, though he had only just declared that he would never have anything to do with it. In other times the statesman, who respected the obligations of the party system, and recognized the only methods by which it could be safely worked, would have sat quiet under his defeat, and waited till the wheel of time brought fortune once more to his feet. But no—this to Mr. Gladstone was unendurable. *He* could not wait: and the success of his manœuvre became only too fatal a precedent for all subsequent emergencies.

The use, to which the most sacred interests of this country were turned by Mr. Gladstone during Lord Beaconsfield's administration, was even worse than the use made of them by Mr. Fox and Lord Holland. When the Whigs denounced Mr. Pitt, or Lord North, at least they invented nothing. Every Gladstonian may still hang his head with shame when he thinks of the 'Bulgarian atrocities,' and the shameless lies that were circulated through the country, to prove Lord Beaconsfield an accomplice in outrages which never took place. It will hardly be denied, that Mr. Gladstone laboured hard to convince the Emperor of Russia that the English people were on his side, thereby neutralizing all Lord Beaconsfield's efforts to maintain the peace, displaying a contempt for English interests hardly paralleled by Mr. Fox, combined with a fury and a pertinacity altogether peculiar to himself.

Mr. Gladstone succeeded: succeeded entirely—and this is worth remembering—by the power of talk—and then set himself to work, to undo as far as he could all that Lord Beaconsfield had done, thereby violating another of the canons of party government, and making himself largely responsible for the extent to which Russia has recovered her position in the East of Europe, and again become a standing menace both to the interests of England and the peace of the world. But Mr. Gladstone had now entered on a path from which he had not the moral courage to retreat. As he had previously thrown the Church to the wolves, so he now threw after it both the rights of property and the majesty of the law. He was exclusively responsible for the 'reign of terror.' His denunciations of the Irish landowners, necessary for securing the Irish vote, had lighted a flame which, as he could not extinguish it, he found himself compelled to fan. He was forced, in fact, either to crush the agitation, or to lead it. As he could not do the first without forfeiting his position, he was of course obliged to do the second.

This

This policy, however, produced its natural effect upon the mind of England. Long before the time approached for a fresh appeal to the people, Mr. Gladstone's administration had begun to stink in the nostrils of the country. He saw that an appeal to the existing electorate would leave him in a hopeless minority, and that his only chance of escaping ruin was to change the constituencies. Then followed the Reform Bill of 1885, the change of government in July, and the general election in November. The result, though it did not give Mr. Gladstone the majority which he required, made it impossible for Lord Salisbury to retain office, and in February, 1887, the Conservative Ministry resigned. But Mr. Parnell was now master of the situation. If Lord Salisbury had not resigned when he did, the result would have been just the same. The same measures would have been required to turn Lord Salisbury out, as to keep Mr. Gladstone in. Mr. Gladstone played over again exactly the same game which he had played with so much success in 1868. As he had then declared for Disestablishment, so he now declared for Home Rule. He had down to the last moment been opposed to both. But when the emergency arrived, when it became necessary to find some weapon for securing the objects of his ambition, he fell back on them without a moment's remorse or hesitation. As a party weapon to destroy a hated rival, he first employed the dismemberment of the Constitution, and then the dismemberment of the Empire.

But at last Mr. Gladstone discovered, like the Pope, that he had gone too far. The old Liberals, like the old Catholics, set up the standard of independence. They came to an understanding with the Conservatives, voted against the Home Rule Bill, and brought back Lord Salisbury to power. Now, then, what was Mr. Gladstone's next step? Why, exactly of a piece with all the rest. As he had flung the torch into Ireland, he now flung it into Wales. Disestablishment for Wales, Home Rule for Wales, the repudiation of the principle of property for Wales, and violent resistance to the law for Wales, have been openly prescribed, or covertly connived at, in total disregard of truth, justice, honesty, and the most elementary lessons of political science, in the desperate hope, that the combined spectacle of Wales and Ireland in a blaze might frighten the people of England into submission to Mr. Gladstone's will.

It is true that, on the first night of the Session, Mr. Gladstone showed himself alive to the necessity of conciliating public opinion by assuming a meeker attitude, and repudiating all complicity with lawlessness. The 'Heathen Chinees,' when he had

had his sleeve full of aces, still declared that he was ignorant of the game :—

‘ And smiled as he sat by the table  
With the smile that was childlike and bland.’

But we must wait to see what follows before we can place much reliance on these professions of innocence and amity.

And this is modern party government! \* Mr. Gladstone has formed an army prepared to act on this system, and evidently regarding such tactics as the legitimate and now authorized method of Parliamentary combat. Can any reasonable man entertain one moment's doubt, that what they have done in Ireland and in Wales they are prepared to do in England and in Scotland, when the necessary crisis shall arise ; or that the same licence, which they allow themselves in domestic affairs, they will equally extend to foreign and colonial politics, should our relations with Foreign Powers or the Colonies ever give birth to embarrassments available for the same purpose ? He must be blind indeed to the signs of the times, and to the changes which have taken place in the character of English politics, who hugs himself in this delusion. They would use India as they have used Ireland, if they wanted it for the same purpose.

Now we say that this system is incompatible with good government, in any recognized sense of the word. By government we mean something more than the mere administration of the law, and the regulation of the revenue among a small community of well-educated and prosperous citizens, who have neither perplexing social problems nor great Imperial and Colonial interests to solve or to defend ; problems and interests demanding, for their successful treatment, firmness, fortitude, constancy of purpose, patience, self-denial, self-control, respect for authority, which, being human, is fallible, and obedience to laws, the expediency of which may not always be visible on the surface. The government, of which England stands in need, is one that requires the exercise of all these virtues, either by the rulers or the ruled ; and not only this, but a fair field on which to give effect to them, and conditions under which it shall not be impossible for them to bear their natural fruits. Now, how is it possible that these essential qualities can have any fair play under the system we have described ? How can that which is unpopular at first sight have time to outlive prejudice, and develop its salutary properties under conditions which

---

\* For an eloquent denunciation of the system thus inaugurated, see Mr. Balfour's speech, on March 24, at Stalybridge.

make probation impossible, and banish the word patience from our political vocabulary? How can policies or systems display themselves in their full proportions, or achieve any results by which they can be fairly tested? How can any minister act with the firmness and independence necessary to all good government, when there is a party in the country to declare that none but itself shall hold the reins of power on pain of a revolution; and that the moment it finds itself in opposition, it will excite a universal agitation from one end of the kingdom to the other, and break up the foundations of the Constitution to serve for firewood? How, under the constant pressure of this kind of intimidation, can the affairs of the country be so conducted as to preserve, either in our own people, or in the races whom we rule more by moral than by physical force, that respect for prescriptive authority and long-established power, which stands us in the stead of many battalions, and on which, in fact, our vast imperial dominion has hitherto been supported.

Now we say that the plan of Opposition which has brought us to this pass is a corruption of the party system, not indeed absolutely new, but unknown to our fathers and grandfathers. In a former generation there was a well-understood line, below which politicians did not descend in search of party weapons. The Constitution was taken for granted. The Church, the monarchy, and the aristocracy; the authority and dignity of the House of Commons, the ordinary rights of property, and the sanctity of those engagements on the faith of which credit is sustained, and the business of life is carried on, were regarded as lying beyond the range of party struggles. This is not to say, that proved abuses or mischievous customs were not to be reformed, after due enquiry and fair time for consideration; but that it never entered into the heads of statesmen educated in the school of Pitt, Liverpool, Grey, or Russell, as soon as they found all other weapons of attack fail them, immediately to raise a constitutional agitation against the Government. The fundamental institutions of the country were not recognized as debateable ground by the leaders of either great party in the State. And the result was that, after brief periods of commotion, the country had long intervals of repose, in which legislation had time to ripen, and Government to resume that settled aspect before which the waves of violence and disorder instinctively subside, and society regains that sense of stability and security, without which we can enjoy neither respect abroad nor prosperity at home.

Now, as we say, the system is quite different. Now, if a man cannot get political power when he wants it, he rushes out and

sets

sets fire to a church, or blows up an institution, in hopes that in the confusion he may be able to snatch what he desires. Our readers may remember a scene in 'Sybil,' where two worthies, one a great pedigree lawyer, the other a Radical editor, both highly respectable men, are considering how best they can lay their hands on some documents which are safe in a nobleman's castle. After discussing various plans, and dismissing them, one says to the other, 'Well, suppose instead of an insurrection we have a burglary—can you help me to the right hands, there?' This is the system: a system of political dynamite.

It will occur to most people that party, having once contracted these violent and reckless tendencies, will with difficulty be brought back to the regular and quiet habits of its earlier and better days. And this is the more to be feared, that recent changes have made the new system and the new electorate in some respects suitable to each other. It is admitted on all hands—was, in fact, admitted, even before the last change was made—that the new constituencies would require a great deal more attention from their representatives than the old ones. More oratory would have to be expended on them: and what Macaulay fifty years ago called government by speaking would become more absolute than ever. But talkers must have something to talk about. These new audiences are credulous and ignorant in general, but shrewd and suspicious in what directly concerns themselves. They are easily to be carried away by flaming harangues on great subjects of which they understand nothing. But it is not so easy to make dupes of them on questions affecting their daily life and labour. Here, then, is at once the necessity for more frequent speaking, combined with the temptation to make that speaking of a kind which shall astonish and confound the listener. We have accepted democracy, and must accept its consequences. We cannot eat our cake and have it. If we choose to be prodigals for the sake of being called Liberals; and to make ducks and drakes of all the elements of order and stability, to win the fickle applause of those who are the natural enemies of both, we must pay for our whistle. Every fresh enlargement of the Franchise has been a fresh stimulus to agitation: a fresh encouragement to the trade and ambition of the demagogue; and it should have been easy to foresee that in process of time nothing would be sacred from his clutches.

To say nothing of the difference in the voters, the greater influence of the aristocratic element in the old regime kept these tendencies in check. There were comparatively few constituencies where it would pay to take so much trouble. Now there  
are

are none where it fails. We must not be surprised, therefore, to find the popular oratory of the day, not only taking a wider range than formerly, and so dealing with subjects of quite a different kind from those which once formed the battle-ground of parties, but also that the same style is now affected by politicians of a much higher rank, and much more dignified pretensions, than were the demagogues of old, the Wilkeses, the Cobbetts, the Hunts, the Burdetts, and the Duncombes. We have created an appellate Tribunal in politics, where ignorance and credulity sit in judgment on knowledge and intelligence, their decision being absolute and final. Those who plead in these courts, therefore, must adapt themselves to the capacity of their hearers. We only reap as we have sown. And it will not be many years before we shall be able to understand, whether the Constitution of this country possesses sufficient recuperative energy to recover its balance, or whether what we now see is the beginning of the end.

It is idle in the meantime to talk the language and ape the aphorisms of an aristocratic period, when one by one the steadying forces of society are gradually being withdrawn from among us. Yet we do continue to talk as if the old fabric still remained firm on its foundations. Still we hear, as of old, the familiar assurance, that in this or that particular instance the sequence of cause and effect will be arrested in our favour. Actions will not be followed by their natural consequences. Oh, says the plausible optimist on the verge of some impending change, which affects the vital organs of our social system, 'You will find, after all, that it will not make so very much difference: things will go on pretty much as before, I have no doubt.' But things will *not* go on as before. The deflection from the old path, which seems almost imperceptible at first, becomes wider every day. Thanks to our national character, the result of ages of tranquillity and good government, processes of changes proceed among us so easily and quietly, that being conscious of no abrupt transitions, we fail to hear the footsteps of revolution, and only recognize it at last, when it is too late, by its inevitable fruits. But all the time it has been silently marching onwards: and looking back over the last half-century, we begin to gain glimpses of the truth. We see that many things which we despised at the beginning of this epoch, we were mistaken in despising. We see that many predictions, which were ridiculed, have nevertheless been fulfilled: and that many representations, which were only too readily believed, have nevertheless proved false. The British people have been as foolish as the woman, and the Radical destroyer has been



as subtle as the serpent; and now there are many who repent, when repentance perhaps is all in vain, that they ever listened to the lying voice—‘thou shalt not surely die.’

And now, at this stage of our enquiry, may we be allowed to remind those able and indignant Liberals, who frankly acknowledge that the only hope of safety for this country lies in the hands of the Conservatives, that they will not promote the combination which they have at heart, by raking up past grievances, and endeavouring to throw the whole blame, for the pass to which we have now been brought, on the Conservative party. We are referring more particularly to an article by Professor Goldwin Smith, which appeared in the February number of the ‘National Review,’ in which he says, ‘the only sound combination is that of all men, who are true to the integrity of the nation, and opposed to socialistic revolution,’ adding that, if the Conservative party will act as the core of such a combination, &c., they may yet be the means of saving us from ruin, &c., statements with which we need not say that we entirely agree. But it should be obvious at a glance that such a combination is likely rather to be retarded than promoted by retrospective criticism, urging that the Conservatives have for forty years been wandering in a wilderness of error, a prey to dishonourable ambition, and a Jesuitical policy ‘of intrigue and legerdemain.’ These are the words used by the writer of the article: and it is because we see in such assertions, not only a very superficial reading of our recent history, but also an attack on the party to whose hands the public safety is committed, calculated to lower them in public opinion, and to cause many Liberal Unionists to ask themselves whether any good, after all, can be expected from an alliance with such men, that we feel bound to protest against them, and, to the best of our ability, to answer them.

Whose fault was it? Let us first take the particular question of Parliamentary Reform; and on this we think two positions are absolutely incontestable; the one, that no Conservative Government from 1857 to 1867 would have been allowed to hold office without introducing a Reform Bill; the other, that no Conservative Opposition could have prevented a Liberal Government from carrying one, except by doing it themselves. Lord Palmerston prevented the Liberal Party from doing it, after he got back to power in 1859, but he would not have scrupled to use Parliamentary Reform as a lever for turning out the Tories, had his party remained in Opposition. As it was, he joined in a vote of want of confidence, the main ground of which was that Lord Derby’s Reform Bill did not go far enough.

enough. Lord John Russell himself, the leader of the Liberal party, had reopened the question before the Crimean War. The circumstances of that war lent a great stimulus to the movement. After the conclusion of peace, it was again taken up by Mr. Bright, and a pressure brought to bear upon the Government, which even Lord Palmerston, had he remained in office, would have found it impossible to resist. But what was the conduct of the great bulk of the Liberal party at this conjunction of affairs? We do not mean the Radicals only, but the main body of the party, including both aristocratic Whigs and middle-class Liberals. Did they hold out the slightest encouragement to the Conservative party to resist the agitation, or did not they one and all declare that a new Reform Bill was imperatively necessary, and press the demand for one with all the force at their disposal? Under these circumstances the Conservatives were certainly not to blame for trying to do the best they could with a question which, if not settled by themselves, was surely to be taken up by their opponents in a much more revolutionary spirit.

From 1859 to 1865, though the Ministry had dropped it, the Liberal party kept Reform before the public. Motions in support of it were frequently carried in the House of Commons, Lord Palmerston himself always voting in its favour, to show, as he said, that he was not hostile to 'the principle;' and it was universally allowed, that his retirement from the helm would be, as it was, the signal for reviving the demand in louder tones than ever. Those who are able to persuade themselves, that Mr. Gladstone's Bill of 1866 would have laid agitation to rest for any considerable period, and that the country after abandoning the 10*l.* qualification would have been content for many years with a 7*l.* qualification, are entitled, if they please, to blame Mr. Disraeli and Lord Derby for the part they played. But even those who think so will hardly deny, that there was room for honest differences of opinion on the subject. They will hardly say, that men like Mr. Henley, for instance, would deliberately lend themselves to a policy of dishonour. Mr. Henley had shown his independence by resigning in 1859. He was not the man to be dragged forward any faster than he had a mind to go. Yet he gave his most cordial approval and support to what Professor Goldwin Smith calls a policy of intrigue, legerdemain, and Machiavellism. No; it was not this. The Conservative leaders in 1867 may have made a mistake—but it was an honest mistake—and it is not clear that we can call it a mistake at all, except on one hypothesis, which we believe has no foundation.

It

It may be said, perhaps, that the Conservative party—though they had failed ‘to stem the tide of democracy,’ for hinting at which, in 1852, Lord Derby had been howled down by all sections of Liberals; though their opposition to the most sweeping Reform Bills had been all in vain;—would still have occupied a better position for resisting the future progress of revolutionary doctrines, had they held aloof from the movement altogether, and waited till England either recovered her senses, or was so thoroughly alarmed by the prospects of anarchy and Socialism as to place herself unreservedly in their hands. This theory sounds well on paper, but is not reconcilable with facts. By the time the danger came, the party would have ceased to exist; to exist, that is, in a Parliamentary sense, with the organization, the discipline, and the experience, which alone would have enabled them to make head against the dominant party. Had they acted as we have here supposed, the Liberals would have suffered no opportunity to pass without jeering at them as wooden-headed obstructives, who set themselves indiscriminately against all change, and whose disapproval of any particular innovation, as it was a foregone conclusion, so was utterly worthless in the eyes of all enlightened men. Unless there had been something for the Conservatives to appeal to in disproof of these assertions, they would have been swallowed wholesale by the public, and the result would have been to disable completely the party from fighting a successful battle ‘against the people’s rights,’ as the battle-ground would doubtless have been called.

The Liberals very nearly accomplished this result, as it was. For the weakness of the Conservative party during the quarter of a century which followed the Repeal of the Corn Laws, they are almost exclusively responsible. Some of them may now see that ‘things which they despised thirty years ago, they were mistaken in despising.’ But the mischief was done. The Conservatives had been called clodhoppers and boors, besotted and benighted rustics, selfish and ignorant tyrants, weak and infatuated drivellers; till at last a prejudice was raised against them throughout the country, the force of which scarcely anybody can imagine who is not old enough to remember it. The Liberals for the time had got the upper hand, and they were resolved to keep the Conservatives down; and whenever these last presumed to act upon their own principles, and to condemn any Liberal measure, or popular demand, the above epithets were always let loose upon them, with the effect that might be expected when we remember, that the Liberals had the command of the press, and possessed large majorities in the towns. As  
soon

soon as ever the Conservatives began to act as Professor Goldwin Smith says they ought always to have acted, the Liberal party raised the finger of scorn, and made it as difficult as they possibly could for their opponents to do what this gentleman now says they should have done even more steadily and consistently than they did.

The Liberals having done all they could to disable the Conservative party from discharging that duty which the Constitution naturally imposed upon them, it is rather hard for a leading Liberal writer to turn round and say, that the peril in which we now stand is due to the Conservatives. The Conservatives warned the Liberals of the danger long ago, would they but have listened. Over and over again it was pointed out to them, that the course on which they had entered could have but one ending: that they could not stop: that, if they persisted in acting with the Radicals, the Radicals would soon become their masters. They were warned of the tendencies of modern Liberalism, and that every fresh inroad on the power and authority of those classes and those institutions, which act as a breakwater, was a step towards the goal which Professor Godwin now sees plainly in front of us. Those who uttered these warnings were laughed to scorn, and compared with those false prophets who predicted such dreadful consequences from the first Reform Bill. And have not those very consequences come to pass? And must not the Liberals of thirty years ago, who looked back with contempt on the convictions of such men as Peel, Wellington, and Canning, begin to be conscious, if any of them are still alive, that the things which they despised then, they were mistaken in despising.

But the Liberals of a former generation would listen to no such remonstrances. And so the mischief went on. Lord Derby saw clearly enough the nature of the perils that awaited us, and also that we had little chance of resisting them with success, unless that combination should be formed which Professor Goldwin Smith now desires. But it does not always answer to put off these arrangements till the last moment, and to defer getting ready for battle till the foe is in the midst of us. Both in 1852 and in 1858 the materials for a strong Government existed, the formation of which might have altered the history of England. Lord Derby made on each occasion the most liberal offers to Mr. Goldwin Smith's friends. But they would not. They had other objects in view. A strong Conservative Government might then have been constituted, consisting of homogeneous elements, and not like the so-called strong Liberal Governments containing within themselves the  
germs

germs of dissolution from the first. If the 'scheming ambition' of any one man stood in the way of such arrangements, that man was certainly not a follower of Lord Derby. But the opportunity was lost, exclusively owing to the action of the Liberal section of the party, and never returned.

*'Nunc sera querelis*

*Haud justis assurgis, et irrita jurgia jactas.'*

We sincerely trust we shall have no more of this. Our object in writing the last few pages has been something more than to vindicate the past history of the Conservatives from charges which have often been refuted. It has been to show that, in asking the country to follow them, and the Liberal Unionists to unite with them, they are only claiming what is due to a party, whose foresight has been proved, and whose political principles, long misrepresented and caricatured, are now justified by events, and recognized as the only security we have against revolution of the worst kind. When, in addition to these titles to public confidence, it is remembered that the new mode of warfare now adopted by the Opposition demands a new formation on the part of their adversaries to meet it, and a great increase of solid strength throughout the country to withstand the shock, their claim seems to be irresistible. If good government is to be any longer possible, it can only be by the frank recognition of truths which the Conservatives have long preached to inattentive ears, and by the consolidation of all the various Conservative forces which exist in this country. 'The political tendencies,' says Professor Goldwin Smith, 'natural to the poorer class of artisans are more easily stimulated by the promise of vast organic changes which appeal to their imagination, than by administrative reforms by which they would scarcely be affected.' The era of 'blazing questions' is not yet over, and nothing but the strength of a perfectly united party, of which the several sections shall repose perfect confidence in each other, without misgivings on the score of statesmanship, sagacity, or fidelity, can hope to defeat an enemy who openly raises the banner of plunder and destruction, and offers the spoils of churches, aristocracies, and perhaps crowns, to stimulate the passions of his army.

We are not necessarily pessimists because we are not optimists. England has been brought into great danger by a false system of political philosophy, but she has strength enough left to throw off the disease which has fastened upon her, if she has moral courage to persevere in the necessary regimen. Only there must be no more mistakes. No more despising of things

now, to find out ten years hence that we were mistaken in despising them. And there is good reason for hope, not only in the present attitude and policy of Her Majesty's Government, but in the language held by Liberals such as Professor Goldwin Smith, and statesmen like Mr. Gladstone himself, that we have really weathered the shoals, or may at least feel pretty confident of doing so. When a veteran literary Liberal, who has fought under the banner of Liberalism with unrivalled ability and merciless severity for nearly forty years; when even he is found admitting that the party, which he has spent his life in denouncing, is now our only hope; when Mr. Gladstone describes the Liberal Unionist, or in other words the national Conservative party, as one representing nine-tenths of the intelligence, the culture, the education, and the property, of the kingdom; it must be clear to everybody that some very great change has passed over English society, and English political thought, since the days when the Conservatives were spoken of by all superior persons in tones of pity or contempt. And this change, be it remembered, is due to no change in the policy of the Conservatives themselves. On the contrary, as far as they have changed, Mr. Goldwin Smith and others believe them to have changed for the worse. He especially exhorts them to beware of coquetting with Liberalism, and to cast to the winds all such fantasies as Tory democracy. It is not therefore by having liberalized or popularized their creed that they have qualified themselves for becoming the preservers of their country. No: if they are to play that glorious part in history, it will only be by adhering steadfastly to their original principles; and by regaining for the territorial aristocracy all their former influence, by a return to all their former habits. When we find, as we say, that these counsels proceed from the pen of a distinguished Liberal, who always belonged to the advanced wing of the party, and never stood half-way between the two, are we not fully justified in believing that England is now at last in a fair way of recovery; and that a lesson has been read to the over-sanguine and disdainful apostles of democratic progress, which will teach them a little wholesome suspicion of their own infallibility in future, and more respect for the guidance of experience and authority, than they were formerly disposed to entertain? Should this, indeed, be the fortunate result of the present state of public affairs, we shall have reason to bless Mr. Parnell instead of cursing him, and future generations will relate how, in striving to be the destroyer, Mr. Gladstone became the saviour of the Empire.

- ART. IX.—1. *Finance accounts of the United Kingdom*, 1886–87. London, 1887.
2. *Statistical Abstracts of the United Kingdom*, 1860–1886. London, 1861–1887.
3. *Annual Local Taxation Returns*, 1885–86. Parts I.—VII. London, 1887.
4. *Speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House of Commons*, March 26, 1888.
5. *A History of Taxation and Taxes in England*. By Stephen Dowell, Assistant-Solicitor of Inland Revenue. 2nd edition. 4 vols. London, 1888.

VAST, almost beyond description, is the power for weal or woe of a Minister who controls the finances of a great country like our own. Vigorous enterprize stands waiting for his word. Trained intelligence looks to him for the signal to commence, or to decline, those great works on which the occupation of countless thousands depends. He is able to unfetter, or to restrain, the industry of vast masses of the people. His action may mitigate the sufferings which a deficient harvest will create. His skill may help a nation to surmount the drag of long years of depressed trade. If the advice he gives is the right one, he is entitled to address the legislature in words like the following:—

‘By pursuing such a course as this it will be in your power to scatter blessings among the people, and blessings which are among the soundest and most wholesome of all the blessings at your disposal; because, in legislation of this kind, you are not forging mechanical supports and helps for men, nor endeavouring to do that for them which they ought to do for themselves; but you are enlarging their means without narrowing their freedom, you are giving value to their labour, you are appealing to their sense of responsibility, you are not impairing their temper of honourable self-dependence.’

This brilliant sentence, taken from the Budget speech made by Mr. Gladstone in 1860—the second of his Budgets,—gives no exaggerated description of the influence which a British Chancellor of the Exchequer possesses. Well indeed would it have been for the speaker, had he always adhered to the path of moderation which these observations indicated. Mr. Gladstone’s power has extended far beyond the limits of the assembly he then addressed, or the duration of the Government of which he was then the main support. For seven years before that time, and onwards, down to the present, the plans of finance, which he has inaugurated, have guided the economic policy



of the British people. There are some indications that the spell may be broken by the actual holder of the office which Mr. Gladstone then filled. Mr. Goschen's Budget of last year was clearly tentative; the same remark applies, in some measure, to his second Budget. But the opinion of friends and foes alike agrees, that in it he has shown his possession of the power to originate a method of his own; and, as will be seen from its construction, it may be hoped that he will prove himself to be no more a rigid adherent of Mr. Gladstone in finance, than in ordinary policy.

But, with the possible exception of Mr. Goschen, all the holders of the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1860 onwards, who are responsible for Budgets, even Mr. Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield), Mr. G. W. Hunt, Mr. Robert Lowe (Lord Sherbrooke), Sir Stafford Northcote (Lord Iddesleigh), Mr. Childers, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, may be counted as disciples of Mr. Gladstone. Lord Randolph Churchill held the office for too short a time to enable any definite opinion to be formed as to the course he would have taken in financial matters.

Thus Mr. Gladstone's influence as a Finance Minister is almost unparalleled. For more than a quarter of a century his voice in these matters has reigned supreme. His rising ascendancy, indeed, may be dated further back even than 1859 and 1860. Mr. Gladstone's first Budget statement, in some respects the most remarkable that he has produced, was made in 1853. Had it not been that Sir George C. Lewis, who succeeded Mr. Gladstone as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1855, held opinions on the administration of finance very different from, if not diametrically opposed to, those of Mr. Gladstone, we might consider that the authority of the latter extended over a third rather than a quarter of a century. Nor are we yet quite certain, that it may not extend even longer, though undoubtedly, of recent years, the method inaugurated by him has produced inconveniences which only habit enables the country to endure; and, though it may be hoped the course indicated by Mr. Goschen may succeed in gradually bringing our system into a better shape, still for duration of influence no British Finance Minister can show a record at all equal to that of Mr. Gladstone. The power of William Pitt, great as it was, extended over a much shorter period of time. Canning's brilliancy was evanescent. The system inaugurated by Peel, in some senses more lasting, was less the personal policy of the man. In short, for more than a century—we will not carry the enquiry further back, lest any one should quote  
the

the name of Lord North, whose method of finance was in some senses more disastrous than any single act of a Minister has ever been since—no one at the Exchequer has exercised an influence over our finance in the least approaching to that of Mr. Gladstone. He has not been blessed with the happiness which Titus enjoyed, *Imperii felix brevitatem*.

The review of past finance, which we shall lay before our readers, will be free from party prejudice. Though Lord Sherbrooke counts as a Liberal politician, and though as a financier we can only look on him as Mr. Gladstone's scholar,—a sort of 'ad interim' manager placed in the post till his chief desired to resume the duties himself, no one can forget that he was, if not the ringleader, the most distinguished of that discontented Liberal handful, 'that party of two,' to use the words of Mr. Bright, who fled 'into the Cave of Adullam,' whose action precipitated the fall of the Russell ministry in 1866, and drove Mr. Gladstone from the Treasury. Lord Iddesleigh again, who may be reckoned as one of Mr. Gladstone's pupils in finance, was prominent among Conservative statesmen. It is not with political opinions, but with the study of 'political arithmetic,' as our ancestors styled it, that we are now concerned. And if, while doing homage to Mr. Gladstone's great administrative resources, we have to point out how dangerous is the track on which he has launched the finances of the country, we shall, while doing this, be able to show, that the course pursued by Mr. Gladstone is in direct opposition to his own pronounced judgment. He has followed Peel in the worst portions of his policy, the concentration of the system of finance on a few points. This method, which was justified by the position of affairs in the time of Sir Robert Peel, has been carried to an extreme length by Mr. Gladstone; who has lacked, curiously enough, two opposite qualities—foresight and retrospective power—being apparently unable to perceive to what his own actions must lead, or to remember the denunciations that he himself had launched at the very course he has followed. A dangerous course need not lead to destruction; but it would be difficult now for Mr. Gladstone himself or his disciples to retrace their steps. Lord Sherbrooke and Lord Iddesleigh have indeed outrun their master, following him unfortunately most closely in those very points of his fiscal policy, which a real apprehension of the needs of the time should have led a statesman to distrust.

It is the vice of a school of copyists to exaggerate the chief features in the style of their master, till they are developed into glaring defects. This is the history of the decline of Schools  
of

of Thought, of Schools of Painting, of Schools of any kind of intelligence. That it should be so in the case of Mr. Gladstone's financial followers need therefore excite no wonder. And when the fiscal course of the country for the last twenty-five years is surveyed, few will be found to dispute, that it is a course which cannot safely be repeated.

We shall begin by praising that which is praiseworthy. Whatever may be the judgment of posterity upon Mr. Gladstone's financial career as a whole, there can be no doubt as to the high place which will be assigned to his Budget of 1853. The financial proposals, which Mr. Disraeli put forward in the December of 1852, ingenious as they were, did not commend themselves to the House of Commons; though Mr. Disraeli's proposal to reduce the duty on tea was accomplished, and indeed carried further, by other hands. The same may be said of his suggestion about the hop duty. These were thought, at the time, weak points in his Budget, but they have found acceptance since; and the Legislature, which then declined to reduce the tax by half, has since entirely repealed it. The increased charge laid on brewers, to take the place of the hop duty, falls entirely on other shoulders.

Much of the unpopularity of Mr. Disraeli's Budget arose from the manner in which he proposed to deal with the Income Tax; hence the reference to this tax, which Mr. Gladstone was bound to make, was looked forward to at the time with the greatest interest. The Income Tax, indeed, had legally expired. Mr. Gladstone put before the House the alternative propositions which would have been needed, if it were not renewed—stating at the same time the reasons which made him consider that, while it was necessary to continue it for the time, it was not adapted to form a permanent portion of our fiscal system. Sir Robert Peel, he said, 'called forth from repose this giant, who had once shielded us in war, to assist our industrious toils in peace.' By its assistance, Mr. Gladstone continued, 'I hope ere long you may perfect the reform, the effective reform, of your commercial and fiscal system.' He even went further, and actually assumed, that the re-arrangement of the finances of other countries would follow. 'I, for one, am bold enough to hope, nay to expect and believe, that in reforming your own fiscal and commercial system, you have laid the foundation of similar reforms—slow, perhaps, but certain in their progress—through every country of the civilized world.' When, he continued, the first part of this proposal, the effective reform of our own commercial and fiscal system was realized, the Income Tax was to be laid aside. Such was Mr. Gladstone's anticipation;

anticipation ; but, as the futility of financial prophecy has rarely been more conspicuously exemplified than in the case of Mr. Gladstone's reference to the effect of our example on foreign nations in the way of inducing them to adopt Free Trade, so also the brilliant prospect, held out to the House, of the ultimate entire remission of the Income Tax, has never been realized. The 'temporary character' of the tax is referred to, over and over again, in the speech of 1853. 'We found ourselves on the principle that the tax ought to be marked as a temporary measure.' There is no doubt, that Mr. Gladstone is far too able an administrator to be blind to the glaring defects in the working of the Income Tax. But his proposal was to use it on this occasion in the manner that it ought to be used—as a temporary measure—to enable some very important remissions of indirect taxation to be made. The soap duties, the duty on tea, the duties on many articles of food, were dealt with. On the whole, indirect taxation, estimated at something like 5,400,000*l.*, was to be remitted. The effect of this scheme on the Customs tariff was immense. On 13 articles of food, including tea, reductions of duties were made; 133 other articles also were reduced; and 123 were set free from duty altogether.

The Budget of 1853 was one which Peel might have delighted to propose, and Mr. Gladstone was fully justified in the proud boast of his concluding words:—

'We have the consolation of believing that by proposals such as these we contribute, as far as in us lies, not only to develop the material resources of the country, but to knit the hearts of the various classes of this great nation yet more closely than heretofore to that Throne, and to those institutions, under which it is their happiness to live.'

As our theme is the influence which Mr. Gladstone and his scholars have exerted over the finance of the country, we shall pass on at once to the Financial Statement of 1860, the most powerful of all Mr. Gladstone's Budget speeches, and the occasion in which he took a higher position as a Statesman, so far at least as fiscal questions are concerned, than at any other time in his long career. The Budget of 1860 contains the financial arrangements necessitated by the commercial Treaty with France; it also contains the proposal to abolish the Paper Duty, which was at the time rejected by the House of Lords. Into the details of this rejection by the Upper House, and of the resultant quarrel between the two branches of the Legislature, we do not propose to enter; and we will confine ourselves to stating, that the keeping up of the Paper Duty proved

at

at the time a very opportune assistance to the Exchequer, and diminished the very large deficiency which Mr. Gladstone had ultimately to acknowledge. While party questions are out of our scope, the broader questions of policy, of which finance forms frequently the pivot, are well within our view. To revert to the Treaty with France, rarely has a statesman possessed or made use of such an opportunity for undoing the ill effects of the legislation of former times. The political estrangement between England and France—an estrangement centuries old—had been followed and confirmed, on both sides of the Channel, by a system of prohibitory duties. The fiscal disadvantages of this system were obvious, yet the courage required to break it down was great; for the sentiment of separation, if not of violent opposition, had become, so to say, engrained and embodied in the popular thought of both nations. The two countries seem indeed designed by nature for friendly commerce with each other; each able to supply the other's wants. Climate, natural resources, national aptitude, individual intelligence, all point the same way; but the artificial barriers raised by man had prevented the realization of this beneficial intercourse. Mr. Gladstone aimed at restoring the currents to their natural channel, and to a great extent he succeeded. Two years later, in 1862, he was able to refer to the increase of trade resulting from the treaty,

'giving rise, I will not say to a certainty, I will not even say to a confident expectation, but, at least to a hope, that the commercial relations between these two great countries, valuable as they are in themselves, and still more valuable as they are the pledges, guarantees, and mainstays of those friendly feelings between England and France which must always be the best security for the general peace and tranquillity of the world—these figures give rise, I say, to a hope, that the commerce between these two great countries is at last about to approach a scale something like what nature intended it to be, and something like what it was intended to be by that greatest of all our Peace-Ministers, Mr. Pitt, but as unlike as possible to what the obstinacy, the follies, and the prejudices, of other men had made it and had kept it.'—Gladstone's 'Financial Statements,' p. 282.

The expected rate of progress in the development of commerce between the two countries may not have been maintained exactly as presaged by friendly anticipation, but the wisdom of the great effort of reconciliation has been signally proved. With this effort Mr. Gladstone's work as a financier culminated. Brilliant as have been the strokes of administrative financial skill more than once exhibited since, the good resulting from them has been far more than outweighed by the fundamental

errors

errors in the principle on which his subsequent course has been based.

It is not always possible for the wayfarer, when climbing the sides of some steep and craggy mountain, to point out the exact moment at which the summit is attained. He may believe, that he has reached the very top; he may even believe, that his route tends downwards. But not till the altered stress on his own muscles, till the altered course of the water flowing by his side, assure him that he has actually begun to descend, can he be absolutely certain of the fact. This simile will occur to the mind of the student of Mr. Gladstone's finance. Conscious as he must be of the vast rhetorical ingenuity with which his financial statements have been put forth, he is compelled, however unwillingly, to recognize the fact, that the subsequent Budgets, full of administrative skill as they are, fail to bear out the magnificent promise of the earlier days. Growing national wealth has prevented the ill-effects of these later Budgets from being as conspicuous as they would otherwise have been, but the sound principle of largely distributing the burden of taxation has been put aside. The great, the overwhelming, drawback to the permanent fame of Mr. Gladstone as a financier is, that he did not know when to stay his hand in the very work of remission, in which he had won his first and his most enduring laurels. A careful observer of this tendency in Mr. Gladstone's fiscal work has observed, that it will not be immediately clear when and where the first step downwards was taken. Mr. Stephen Dowell, a very competent writer, places it in 1870, in his valuable '*History of Taxation*,' which we are glad to welcome in a second edition.

'At this point,' he says, 'standing as we did in respect of taxes after Lowe's budget of 1869, we ought, in the opinion of many who had carefully considered our fiscal position, to have stayed our hand, leaving untouched the remaining branches of the pagoda tree. It is all very well to quote the legend of the golden bough, or the oak, on darkly-wooded Algidus, which

'Per damna, per caedes, ab ipso  
Ducit opes animumque ferro.

'No doubt a good deal of judicious pruning had been accomplished; but to go further would be to commence the work of destruction. Who could complain of the existing taxes? Was ever, in the history of the world, a large revenue so easily raised?'—'*History of Taxation and Taxes in England*,' 2nd edition, vol. ii. p. 380.

Mr. Dowell, it will be seen, marks the dividing line at the year 1869 or 1870. We are inclined to place it several years earlier.

earlier. Already, in 1862, Mr. Gladstone had declared, 'I am bound also to say, that the present high level of our expenditure is still such a level as ought to attract the serious and careful consideration of the House. It is a higher level than can be borne by the people, even in their present state, with comfort and satisfaction.' Already, in the same year, he had given the warning, 'we have exhausted what I may call our casual resources. They remain no longer. With favourable circumstances, our revenue will maintain itself, and will do more than maintain itself. But we should not be always counting upon favourable circumstances.' Again, in 1863, he fully acknowledged 'that the burden of taxation was inconveniently heavy.' In 1864 he doubted whether 'reasonable thrift could be secured compatibly with the affirmation of the principle, that the Income Tax is to be made a permanent portion of the fiscal system of the country, and to be employed, not for the particular exigencies of the moment, nor for the working out particular reforms, but for satisfying the ordinary every-day expenses of the nation.' It is unfortunate that these brave words should have been acted on so little by the speaker—that he should have since adhered to the very want of principle that he thus denounced.

In the year 1862, it should be observed, the Revenue was 69,300,000*l.* In 1887 the Budget provided for 91,000,000*l.* Since 1862 the Sugar Duties, the registration charges on wheat and timber, and the duty on horses, have been removed, and the tax on tea reduced. All these were charges which it was pleasant for a Finance Minister to repeal or to reduce; but the question is, can it be prudent to prune away the indirect sources of revenue so greatly? What we have to complain of is, that although Mr. Gladstone knew the ill effects which the retention of the Income Tax would cause, yet he and his disciples in finance have cut away those other sources of revenue which might have superseded it. Whilst pointing out how bad it is, he and his followers have retained it.

It is one of the most difficult duties of a statesman to adjust the balance between direct and indirect taxation. As early as the year 1854, the revision of the Customs tariff, that had been begun by Huskisson and Peel, was practically accomplished; and the 1200 articles on the tariff in 1842 had been brought down to the number of forty-eight. Later on, other articles were freed; paper in 1862. The tax on tea was reduced to 1*s.* in the pound in 1863, with the declaration by Mr. Gladstone, that 'It is thoroughly understood by the trade, and by the country, that when the tea duty shall be reduced to  
1*s.* per



1s. per pound, the reduction will be, so far as we may presume to look forward into the future, a final measure.' Though this diminution was advisable, the further reduction to 6d., made in 1865 by Mr. Gladstone himself, apparently utterly oblivious of what he had said only two years before, can hardly claim to be equally advantageous to the community. The consumption of tea per head of the population increased steadily, it is true, for the eight or ten years immediately subsequent to the last-mentioned reduction, but for nearly ten years it has remained almost stationary; while the repeal of the duty on timber in 1866, which stood at 1s. the load on hewn, and 2s. the load on sawn timber, is one of those measures that lose sight of the first principles on which taxation should be founded. An article of trade, worth very various sums up to 10l. or more a load, can hardly be influenced in price by a mere registration charge, an almost nominal duty. We have examined the price lists of the period, and are unable to trace any connection between the remission of the duty and the price of timber, either at that time or since.

No doubt, theoretically, such a charge is open to all the objections which may be raised against an *ad valorem* duty; but in practice this objection does not apply. When the charge was 2l. 15s. or 3l. 5s. a load, and a differential duty existed between foreign and Colonial timber, trade was injuriously shackled, and house building and other occupations were seriously restricted. But a small duty would not have had these results; and a source of revenue, which might have been of considerable service, was, without any corresponding benefit to the timber trade or the country, thrown away. The timber duty in the year 1863 may be put roughly at 280,000l. Had it been levied on the same basis in 1887, the proceeds would have been about 474,000l. This would be an increase of much more than half—nearly seventy per cent. But the value of the house property in the United Kingdom had moved up from 62,000,000l. in 1863, to 117,000,000l. in 1887. That is to say, it had nearly doubled. Hence it is clear that the increase in the imports of timber has not kept pace with the growing prosperity of the country. The fact is, that while judicious reductions of duty stimulate consumption greatly, total remission, where the duty is small and not oppressive, is only followed by a moderate increase in the use of the article formerly taxed.

May we venture, in the present slack state of feeling on such subjects, to quote the name of McCulloch, a thinker who, with all his faults, possessed a vigorous grasp on many branches  
of

of Economic Study? We are not concerned here to defend every word or every expression in his 'Principles of Political Economy,' but there is no question that in his work on 'Taxation and the Funding System,' he showed a powerful appreciation of those portions of the question which lie below the surface. Though to some it may sound like a truism, there is no doubt that McCulloch was correct in laying down the general principle—that taxes are often really paid by different classes in the community from those on whom they are originally imposed—that it would 'be an error to suppose, that a tax necessarily falls on capital because it is laid on capital, or on income because it is laid on income. A moderate tax laid on capital may be, and generally is, defrayed out of income; whereas an oppressive tax laid on income has in most cases to be partly paid from capital. In most instances, indeed, little can be learned in regard to the real incidence of a tax from the way in which it may be imposed.' It is also certain, McCulloch further says—and experience shows the correctness of his observation—that taxes, when judiciously imposed, and not carried to too great a height, absolutely occasion an increase of industry and economy, and but rarely encroach on capital. Taxation, when carried too far, may be, and sometimes is, a cause of diminished production. It is the manner in which it is imposed, on which its influence on the prosperity of the taxpayer depends. This is the case equally with direct and indirect taxation. Those 'two attractive sisters,' as Mr. Gladstone once, in a burst of rhetoric, described the two methods by which Revenue may be raised, 'both having the same parentage (for the parents of both I believe to be Necessity and Invention), differing only as sisters may differ,' have a vast, it might be called a magnetic, influence on each other's fate. The taxes on tea, tobacco, and the other articles consumed by the labourer, though in the first instance paid by him, are in some degree reimbursed to him in his wages. Increased exertion and economy on the one hand, and increased wealth relatively to population on the other, cause the void in the wages to be made good. The spur which is given to invention and economy is the explanation of what Garnier calls the most surprising phenomenon of Political Economy, '*l'accroissement rapide et prodigieux de la richesse chez les nations les plus chargées d'impôts sur les articles de la consommation générale.*'

Before passing on to later Budgets, a few words on the general question, how taxes operate, may make our survey clearer.

Taxes are evils. Some are necessary; they must be borne; but

but the Statesman, who seeks to benefit one class at the expense of another, is certain to find himself beaten in the long run where capital and labour are both free. Facility of emigration on the part of the working population will always prevent taxation on them from being unduly heavy. Freedom for the movement of capital will direct its flight elsewhere, if it finds itself over-handicapped with oppressive duties. A tax, the amount of which is not replaced by exertion or economy, is a distinct deduction from the wealth of a country, unless it is, what few taxes ever can be, laid out in a productive manner. No error can be greater than that of thinking, that the only point to be considered is the amount of revenue which has to be realised. On the other hand, remission of taxation may be but a doubtful benefit. It is scarcely possible for any system of taxation to be absolutely and invariably equal in its drafts. Hence to attain as nearly as possible to equality, it is well that it should be derived from a considerable number of channels, so that no part of the soil should be overdrained to collect the stream that is needed. Here we may refer again to the volume of McCulloch's from which we quoted before, and select a passage in which he has embodied, besides his own, the opinions of two very different, but well-known authorities, Arthur Young, and Sir George C. Lewis. Few have had a better knowledge of the practical working of taxation in this and other countries than Arthur Young; and he was an earnest advocate of taxes on consumption, and of their extension to a great number of articles. In his 'Travels in France,' when treating of taxation in that kingdom, which was as ruinous as could well be imagined, we find the following words:—

'The taxes of England are infinitely various; much more so than those of France, especially in the articles of excises and stamps; our taxes are also very great; in proportion to the population of the kingdom, much more than double those of France; yet, with this vast burthen, they are borne by the people with much more ease than the French nation bears less than the half. This is to be attributed not to one cause only, but to many; but amongst these causes, I believe, will be found this great variety of points on which they bear. The mere circumstance of taxes being very numerous, in order to raise a given sum, is a considerable step towards equality in the burthen falling on the people. If I was to define a good system of taxation, it should be that of *bearing lightly on an infinite number of points, heavily on none.*\* In other words, that simplicity in taxation is the greatest additional weight that can be given to taxes, and ought, in every country to be most sedulously

---

\* The italics are in the original.

avoided.—By a system of simplicity in taxation, let it be exerted in whatever method, whether on land, on persons, or on consumption, there will always be classes of the people much lighter taxed than other classes; and this inequality will throw an oppressive burden on those who are exposed to the operation of whatever tax is chosen.'—Vol. i. p. 596, 2nd edit.

Sir George C. Lewis, having quoted this passage in the Debate in the House of Commons on the Budget of 1857, gave it the additional weight of his own high authority:—

'That opinion,' said he, 'though contrary to much that we hear at the present day, seems to me to be full of wisdom, and to be a most useful practical guide in the arrangement of a system of taxation. Had we kept it in view during the last few years, our financial system would have been in a comparatively sound and healthy condition.'—*'McCulloch on Taxation,'* p. 233.

McCulloch wrote in 1863; what his opinion on our present system would have been may be judged by the remarks we have quoted, made at a time when the knife of the extirpator, for by no subterfuge can it be called the pruning knife, had been applied far less freely than has since been the case. We may however mention, that the earlier system in France had been more oppressive from its inequality than even from its amount.

The opinion expressed by Sir George C. Lewis, on the disadvantage of extreme simplicity in a system of taxation, is a weighty one. If any one is disposed to think of Arthur Young as simply a theorist, it must be admitted that George C. Lewis was a Statesman of wide experience, and gifted with a sound and well-balanced mind. His remarks, however, brought up Mr. Gladstone in the Debate, who treated the language of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a total condemnation of the principles, by which Parliament had been guided during the last fifteen years. This was about equivalent to saying that, because a wood had needed careful and judicious thinning for fifteen years, it was desirable to continue to apply the axe till hardly a stick was left standing. It is an abuse of the word 'principle' that what had been the practice, possibly the wise practice, of Parliament for a series of years, should be elevated to the status of a principle never to be disregarded, however much prudential reasons might be in favour of its being departed from.

The entire repeal of the timber duties took place in 1866. Theoretically, no doubt, it should have had an effect; but the effect of a low duty is often very different in real life from what

what theorists expect. Apart from the expense of collection, the remission was sheer loss. Reductions and alterations in taxation should, if possible, be made in such a manner as to enable a greater amount to be raised from the remaining taxes. But, when a tax is the only one of its class, and is remitted entirely, the power of recuperation on what may be called the allied classes, so far as the Revenue is concerned, is taken away. The reduction of a tax on sugar may aid the productiveness of a tax on tea. Both are articles used frequently together, and those who save a little on the one are often willing to spend the more on the other. Judicious remissions have not unfrequently assisted the growth of the Revenue. But it is quite a different thing when a tax is extirpated completely.

A worse instance of the same error in judgment was shown by Mr. Lowe (Lord Sherbrooke) in his first Budget, that of 1869, when he was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer by Mr. Gladstone. This Budget deserves especial attention. It combined, with some useful alterations in detail, such as the revision of the assessed taxes, and one very useful remission, that of the duty on Fire Insurance—which as a tax on prudence and thrift was utterly indefensible—three very considerable errors in judgment, in all of which Mr. Lowe must be regarded as influenced by Mr. Gladstone's ideas. The first was the manner in which the Income Tax was henceforward to be collected. This tax had hitherto been taken in instalments, the arrangement followed being described thus by Mr. Lowe in his Budget speech: 'The first and second quarters are collected in December, the third is collected in January, and the fourth in the April following; and thus the payment is spread over two financial years.' Mr. Lowe altered the method; charged the whole amount for the entire year in one sum, in the winter, choosing the month of January for the date. This was followed by two disadvantages; considerable inconvenience to the tax-payer, and an unnecessary pressure in the money market. The tax is now collected at a time when it is often inconvenient to the tax-payer to meet it, as it is exactly the moment when many other demands come in. The aggregate enormously increases the amount to the credit of the Government at the Bank of England, at a time when the money market, always very sensitive to such alterations in the balance of affairs, is often naturally disturbed. The benevolence of those by whom that great Institution, the centre of our money matters, is guided, may mitigate the force of the pressure, but cannot entirely remove the inconvenience. While it is of the utmost importance to the

the State and the taxpayers, that the taxation should be spread with as great a uniformity as possible over the whole year, and to the money market, that the influx of money, the proceeds of taxation, should also be equal in volume throughout the whole twelvemonth; the present plan involves a plethora of money at one time, with a corresponding dearth at another and a far longer period. Mr. Lowe carried this change through, reckless as to results, not, however, without protest. He fortunately failed in his proposal to sweep away the Railway Duty.

But he succeeded in abolishing the 1s. per quarter registration charge on the imports of corn. Mr. Gladstone had altered this duty in 1864 from the uniform rate of 1s. a quarter on grain, which had been imposed in 1846, to a duty of 3d. per cwt. on wheat, and on other kinds of corn. We do Mr. Gladstone no wrong in connecting him with this particular remission of duty, for, in dealing with it in 1864 he observed to the House that, at the time of the great change in the Corn Laws it had been 'imposed as a nominal duty,' he objected then to its being considered 'as a permanent portion of our finance.' He added, that he should be reluctant to see Parliament committed to any plan which might appear to assume, that a duty of this kind on corn 'should be regarded as a permanent imposition upon the greatest article of human subsistence among us.' These are Mr. Gladstone's remarks. The observations, which Mr. Lowe made, when proposing the remission, were to the effect, that the tax combined in itself all possible objections to a tax, and prevented the country becoming the great entrepôt of corn. The impression, which the reader receives from this flight of rhetoric, is that this country, besides being a great importer, is a great exporter of corn; that heavily laden steamers and ships are constantly sailing from our ports, bearing away our surplus imports to those countries which require the supply. How little the fancy picture, which Mr. Lowe's imaginative remarks call up, corresponds with the reality, may be seen by examining the imports and exports of wheat between the years 1864-1868—the five years before the tax was repealed—and the five years between 1882-1886, the latest returns conveniently to hand. In the first period we imported, in round numbers, 159,700,000 quarters, wheat and wheat-meal, and exported of home and foreign-grown produce 1,700,000 quarters. In the second, the imports were 378,000,000 quarters, and exports 6,400,000. The exports have, it is true, increased slightly in proportion to the imports, when the latter period is compared with the former; from being about 1 per cent. of the imports they have moved to something between  $1\frac{1}{2}$  and  $1\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. But this

this trifling gain to the trade of the country has been obtained at a very heavy sacrifice of Revenue.

The duty on corn amounted in the year ending 31st December, 1868, the last of its collection, to about 860,000*l*. It would have been in the year 1887 about 1,830,000*l*. We have heard the stories about fleets of corn-laden vessels lying off our shores, waiting to learn their destinations, and unwilling to unload because the freight would then have been subject to the duty. But the figures quoted above show how very slightly our trade has gained by the remission; at all events this country has not become in the least 'the 'great corn depôt,' while the Revenue thus flung away cost hardly anything for collection. Mr. Lowe himself stated, in his speech of 12th April, 1869, that 'owing to the smallness of the duty and the bulk of the article, in the collection of the Revenue on corn the excise officers took the merchant's account of the weight, and did not weigh the corn themselves except where they had reason to suspect that an attempt was being made to impose on them.' That the duty produced hardly any effect on our export trade is clear. Part also of the small fraction of exports of corn does not consist of imported corn. Some time since, when the imports of wheat into this country were exceedingly large, some very small exports also took place to northern France. That country was, at the same time, sending us wheat largely. Being interested to know what this meant, we enquired of the English merchant who exported the wheat. How can this answer? What should cause it? His answer was very clear. 'It is a class of wheat, an inferior class, which we can hardly sell here, but for which there is a demand in France.' Whether the grain was used for the food of man or for any manufacturing purpose we cannot say. It was not possible to trace the matter further. But it was obvious that the continuance of the duty would not have hindered the transaction. During the whole time that the shilling duty was in operation in England, a charge on wheat existed in France, which varied according to a very elaborate sliding scale. This was in force from the year 1819 to 1861, when it was changed to a fixed duty and continued till 1885. But no one, who compares the price of wheat in France with the price in England, either during the time when these duties were in operation, or at an earlier or a later period, will be able with any approach to accuracy to trace the effect of the duty on the price. Perhaps this is not wonderful when we reflect, that a tax of a shilling the quarter—or 3*d*. the cwt.—amounts to rather less than  $\frac{1}{3}$ th of a farthing a lb. Could any one but a doctrinaire politician, living in an atmosphere of



theory, have declared that 'it is impossible to imagine any tax which combines more of the qualities that make a tax odious' than this duty, and that it prevented the 'establishment of a great corn depôt in this country.' According to theory, no doubt such a tax would raise 'the price of the article that pays it,' as Mr. Lowe said in his Budget speech; but he himself doubted whether this was the case in fact. 'The consumption of wheat in this country,' Mr. Lowe continued, speaking in 1869, 'is about 22,000,000 quarters annually, the imports are about 8,000,000 quarters, and the home growth about 14,000,000 quarters. I do not mean to say, that the price of the whole 14,000,000 quarters grown at home can be sensibly raised by this tax, but I feel no doubt that a considerable portion of it is, and no one can exactly say how much.'

There is a hesitating tone about these remarks that is unusual in the speaker; perhaps at the moment the puzzling paradox thus put before his hearers occurred to him. How can part only of the supply of an article be influenced by a force continually in operation, and, if only part, how small perhaps might that part be? Surely either all, or none, must, under the circumstances, have been raised in price by the tax in question. There is so little probability of the duty being imposed again, that our remarks, which are simply based on fiscal principles, may be the more free. Some would cite against us the reform in our tariff, associated with the name of Cobden. We can only refer those 'immoderate and unmanageable freetraders,' who are of the class whom Mr. Gladstone stigmatized thus in his Budget speech of 1860, to the facts. And it may be well to ponder on the following quotation from one of our earlier authorities. 'When equal and moderate duties are laid on commodities, without respect to the countries whence, or the channels through which, they come to us, the trade in them is quite as free as it would be were the duties repealed.' There are some persons who consider, that they have solved all economic difficulties when they have named the word, 'Free-trade,' or applied what they consider as the doctrine of demand and supply, to the most dissimilar subjects, ranging from the currency to cab fares. But with such 'unmanageable freetraders' argument is useless.

'Wilful waste makes woful want.' Mr. Lowe, like other spend-thrifts, found this true in 1871, when he was compelled to search for fresh sources of revenue. The tax on matches, had he been able to carry it, would have been a return to correct principles, so far as it would have been a moderate tax spread over a very large field of consumption. But benevolence and rancour alike both combined

combined against the Chancellor of the Exchequer. A few match-boxes, inscribed with Mr. Lowe's classical pun, 'Ex luce lucellum,' and bearing his effigy, lingering in dusty corners of dingy City offices, or in the habitation of a very different class—on a table in the pleasant drawing-room of a learned University dignitary—are probably now the only reminiscences of a scheme which provoked an undue burst of temper from an unthinking and impressible multitude. Jevons discussed the matter in a better spirit: 'I am strongly inclined to regret the loss of two millions and a half of Sugar Duty. Could we have retained the old sugar duty undiminished, we might never have heard of the match tax; and the moral with which I would finish is this: Let us, for the future, allow the Chancellor of the Exchequer to hold a larger surplus on hand, the produce of which will probably go towards the reduction of the national debt, and we shall then deprive him of any opportunity for imposing new taxes.' The Sugar Duties were reduced in 1870, and again in 1873.

The rest of Mr. Lowe's career as Chancellor of the Exchequer hardly calls for much notice, except that the increase in the Income Tax, which he made in 1871, compelled him the next year to enlarge the abatements from 60*l.* to 80*l.* on incomes under 300*l.*—in lieu of 200*l.*, the former amount—60*l.* being the limit at which abatements had previously begun. Little exemptions of this kind always mark the imposition of a tax unduly severe in its operation. They are attempts to adjust the burden to the shoulder, made because the shoulder is galled by the burden up to the full extent of human endurance. The system of abatements was carried a step further in 1876, when incomes under 400*l.* were allowed an abatement of 120*l.*, equal at that time to 130,000*l.* for each penny of tax, or more than a million of money when the tax is 8*d.*, and hence producing further inequalities in a tax which is about as unequal in operation as a tax can be.

This incident is mentioned as an example of the almost invariable working of the rule that, if abatements of this description are once allowed, a demand is sure to be made that the limit may be increased. The growth of these abatements is remarkable already. In 1863, incomes under 200*l.* were allowed an abatement of 60*l.*; in 1872 those under 300*l.* an abatement of 80*l.*; in 1876 those under 400*l.* one of 120*l.* There is no certainty that the limit will stop at that point. There is no finality in 400*l.*, nor can there be any certainty that the exemption is not claimed by many unentitled to enjoy it. The objection to this mode of giving relief from the tax does not, however, apply

to the remission on Life Insurances, or the deduction allowed for wear and tear of machinery. The former is an acknowledgment of the injustice of a tax on thrift, and should in fairness be extended to every kind of saving; the latter is, in principle, an adjustment of assessment to the real value, or nearer to the real value, of the property on which the tax is levied. The tax ought, logically, to be extended to all incomes; the only limit being that at which the cost of collection exceeds the advantage to the Exchequer.

After the Session of 1873 was closed, Mr. Lowe (Lord Sherbrooke) resigned the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, and Mr. Gladstone took the office, together with that of Prime Minister. In the January of the next year, 1874, Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country, promising, among other changes in taxation, the total repeal of the Income Tax. The surplus expected fully justified him in doing this. The elections, however, were unfavourable to Mr. Gladstone, and Sir Stafford Northcote (Lord Iddesleigh) succeeded to the office which Mr. Gladstone had held. Here we must pause for a moment. The occasion was the turning-point in our fiscal history. Those who took an interest in the good administration of the finances of the country, and were anxious to see what method Mr. Gladstone would have followed to secure a due contribution to the Exchequer from the realized and working wealth of the nation—to have known the method by which prosperity was to be made to bear its share of the burden, yet without the intervention of the Income Tax—felt at the time a disappointment akin to his who vainly desired—

‘To call him up who left untold  
The story of Cambuscan bold.’

The scanty references since made by Mr. Gladstone to the method he intended to employ are only tantalizing to the financial student. Some have thought that Mr. Gladstone himself had never exactly formulated his plan. But that he could have produced a scheme amply sufficient for the purpose, and at any rate of prodigious ingenuity, no one doubts. The event has proved a turning-point in the fiscal system of the country, as well as in Mr. Gladstone's financial career. If any one may hesitate to place the date from which his financial policy began to deteriorate so early as 1863 or 1864, there is no doubt that it has continued to move steadily downwards since 1874.

It was not want of knowledge which has caused this fatal declension. No one has possessed a keener perception of the  
the

the blots in our fiscal system. No one has denounced the disadvantages attending on the Income Tax more strongly than Mr. Gladstone. No one has shown more clearly the abuses which that tax leads to. Mr. Gladstone, from the very beginning of his connection with the finances of the country, desired to brand the Income Tax as a temporary expedient. Increasing experience at the Exchequer only strengthened, and strengthened greatly, Mr. Gladstone's aversion to it. He has objected to the tax on account of the great openings to fraud to which it gave rise. He has objected to its use in time of peace, because it was a reserve of force which should be kept in hand against a time of war. He has objected to it, most of all, because of the extravagance which has accompanied it.

The event has fully justified, as we shall proceed to show, the force of Mr. Gladstone's warning, but, though he has ruled England during many years since, he has never made another serious effort to redress the evil. Moreover, the alterations made in our system of finance by him and the school, which has followed him on both sides of the House, have perpetuated the existence of the tax, and have necessitated its retention, unless a radical alteration in our fiscal system is carried out.

When Sir Stafford Northcote (Lord Iddesleigh) succeeded to office in 1874, he found that the estimated surplus in the ensuing year would, unless some remissions of revenue were made, amount to 5,900,000*l.* The minds of many men had been greatly exercised in wonder, which may be best expressed in the words, 'What would he do with it?' As the whole of the produce of the Income Tax, in the year 1873-74, was little more than 5,700,000*l.*, and the net produce 5,500,000*l.*, it was clear that Sir Stafford Northcote might have swept the tax away at one stroke, and yet have fully balanced his Budget without any other alteration. Instead of this, however, he fell into the error, we must say with regret, the immense and unfortunate error, of continuing the system of remissions inaugurated by Mr. Gladstone. He repealed the Sugar duties, and the duty on Horses, while reducing the Income Tax by a penny.

Mr. Dowell's remarks on the repeal of the Sugar duties are instructive. After pointing out the manner, in which carefully planned diminutions in the duty had been followed by an increase in the revenue received, he refers to the reduction made by Mr. Lowe in 1870, and then continues :—

'Here undoubtedly, in the opinion of many careful and provident persons, who bore in mind our fiscal system in the whole, and,  
regarding

regarding advance in prosperity by leaps and bounds as a temporary and not the normal condition of the progress of the nation, fixed their attention on the eventualities of the future, we should have stayed the process of reduction, which, if carried further, threatened the annihilation of the tax. This tax, with those on tea and coffee, held, in their opinion, a position of peculiar importance: to be kept, in time of peace, at low rates at which, so evenly do these taxes lie over the whole surface of the nation, the pressure was not felt by any one, they were powerful engines available when the nation should be called upon for a general effort in time of war. To abolish these taxes would be to remove the mainstays of our system of taxation.—'History of Taxation,' 2nd edit., vol. iv., p. 28.

To this it may be added, that some of those best qualified to judge hint, that the existing low cost of sugar is not due to the remission of the duty, but that, probably, had that remained at a low rate, the selling price of the article would be much the same as it is now. Be that as it may, Sir S. Northcote repealed the Sugar duty. An increase in the charge for the debt, and some additions to the subventions of local expenditure, swallowed up the remainder of the surplus. In the memory of that occasion there is no recollection more prominent, than the bitter disappointment at so insignificant a result having been reached from so magnificent a starting-point. Never before was a 'noble so frittered down to ninepence;' yet, for the main features of this Budget, Sir S. Northcote might entirely have claimed the authority of Mr. Gladstone. It was only carrying out the same plan of continual diminution in indirect taxation. Thus Sir S. Northcote really reverted to the lines marked out by Mr. Gladstone before he proposed to abolish the Income Tax.

This Budget was the last of what we may call the prosperous period, the period when the Revenue increased by 'leaps and bounds.' Greatly, as we know too well, has the course of events differed since.

Ten years earlier indeed, at least, the causes of the change had become obvious. It was all very well for Mr. Gladstone to put down Sir John Pakington as he did in his Budget speech of 1863, when he named 'Australia' as the cause of the extraordinary growth in the means of the country, but for all that the effect of the 'stream of gold,' its rise and its wane, is most strongly marked on our finance. No Chancellor of the Exchequer has ever benefited by the assistance thus given to the Revenue so much as Mr. Gladstone has done.

In the year 1875 Sir S. Northcote had to announce, that the Income Tax must be retained as a permanent element in our system

system of taxation; and, in discussing the reasons which led the Chancellor of the Exchequer to this opinion, we have to observe that, while objecting to the Income Tax, as employed in this country, we would not diminish the share which the wealthier classes pay towards the public charges. It is the method or type of using the tax, including the perpetual variations in the rate, which is objectionable, and no one has put forward those objections, and shown the manner in which the tax works to the detriment both of the tax-payer and the administrator, more strongly than Mr. Gladstone himself.

Sir Stafford Northcote prefaced his arguments in favour of a permanent Income Tax, by observing that he had not arrived at this opinion without much deliberation. He said:

‘No doubt a good deal of feeling exists with reference to the Income Tax as to which we claimed the right last year, considering how recently we had acceded to office, and the then position of the finances of the country, to reserve our opinion. It would not be candid to attempt to meet the question in the same way now; of course we have been obliged to consider it, and whether it would be desirable to do that which, of course, it is quite possible to do—to make arrangements and re-adjustments by which we may dispense with it or materially modify it.’

Sir S. Northcote continued by showing its use as a war-tax, and also as an engine for the reform of taxation, a use which he considered had practically come to an end. He spoke of the objections to it particularly when at a high rate, and at shifting rates more than at fixed rates; and he concluded by saying:

‘We may, in asking you to renew the Income Tax at 2*d.* in the pound, do so with the hope and belief that it may be regarded as a tax useful in point of amount, but rather to be held in abeyance—ready only for some great emergency, and not to be called upon for trivial occasions.’

Events have unfortunately but little justified this sanguine anticipation. No Chancellor of the Exchequer has been able, when pressure has arisen, to resist raising the charge to the point which the exigencies of the moment seemed to require. Whenever since that date the requirements of the year have called for a larger sum than before, recourse has been had almost entirely to the Income Tax to fill up the deficiency, regardless of the principle that a tax on income should remain, as far as possible, at one uniform level from year to year, because of the additional inequality on temporary and life incomes which is caused by a varying rate.

But, while lamenting that Sir S. Northcote did not use to advantage the great opportunity he possessed of remodelling our

our finances, the thanks of the country are greatly due to him for having arranged a system by which, both in good and in bad times, large reductions are to be made in the National Debt. Mr. Goschen's brilliant success in reducing the interest on the National Debt is greatly due to the power placed in his hands by the system established through the exertions of Sir S. Northcote.

Sir S. Northcote was not, however, always fortunate in his plans for meeting current expenses. In 1876 he had to raise the Income Tax from 2*d.* to 3*d.* merely to meet the growing demand of the Civil Service, and in 1879 again to 5*d.*, the reasons for this being much the same as in 1876. The revenue was depressed, while the demands increased, partly swelled by an increase in the subventions to local authorities. The addition to the Income Tax was not alone sufficient to meet the deficit, and an increase on the duty on tobacco, of 4*d.* in the pound, had to be made.

This alteration in the charge on an article in general use has proved to be, practically, the last serious attempt made by an English Finance Minister to adjust the burden of charge, by increasing both direct and indirect taxation at the same time, when the requirements of the State called for an augmentation in the public revenue. This is the right principle; it has been adhered to by all our great financiers. The wisdom and the justice of this course are obvious. From a fiscal point of view, the throwing a charge on one section of the community, while other sections are free, is obviously disadvantageous to the Exchequer. The justice of an even charge needs no comment. The 'Punch' of the period laughingly described the arrangement as hard on the smoker, who was charged fourpence, while the Income Tax payer was let off with twopence. In practice the plan was found, as some expected at the time, to be objectionable, and the additional charge was removed by Mr. Goschen in 1887. The difficulty of making a small addition to an indirect tax of long standing was curiously illustrated by the result. A duty of this description becomes, as it were, engrained and incorporated into the retail price of the article charged with it, and the purchasers are very unwilling to pay more. The addition of 4*d.* in the pound was fixed at that point, in order to correspond with an increase in the selling price of a farthing the ounce. But, as was observed in the 'Economist' of March 27, 1880, 'Threepence an ounce having become, so to say, a natural price for much of the tobacco in ordinary use, the purchasers resented paying more.' It was in vain that the Mint provided farthings,  
and



and that weighty packets of these coins were supplied to great dealers and those in a large way of trade, to enable change to be given to those who declared that they had nothing about them smaller than a halfpenny. The purchasers held their own. They declined to pay the increased charge. Thus the difficulty was thrown back on the dealer. He had to pay a higher tax on the article he dealt in, while the purchaser would not recoup him. The dealer, in his turn, went to the manufacturer and called on him to furnish 'an article as near as possible to that which he had been in the habit of retailing, as close as might be to the former price. There was only one way,' we quote from the 'Economist,' 'of doing this, to employ more of an inferior and cheap class of tobacco, possessing great power of absorbing moisture.' The tobacco of retail trade is always sold damp, and the object of the manufacturers was to find a tobacco which would 'drink,' as it is called in the trade, as much as possible. Tobacco was discovered which would, it was said, 'drink' 60 per cent. of its weight. 'More tobacco of this class was therefore used, and other cheap descriptions were employed to bring the colour and appearance back as much as possible to what the purchasers were accustomed to.' Hence, though an increasing number of 'ounces' and 'packets of tobacco' probably passed over the counters of the retail dealers, the quantity of tobacco really retained for home consumption diminished for the time. It has since increased. When he brought the duty back to the old rate, Mr. Goschen was, no doubt, advised by the experts attached to the Inland Revenue Office; and no Department in the Service has better or more painstaking advisers than the Inland Revenue Office. But we fear, that the trade has been working so long on the bad lines which the ill-arranged alteration of 1878 involved, that it may be some time before the Revenue receives any important benefit; and that, for the time, the retail dealer will receive the advantage, having avoided loss before. There are few things in which alterations of long-established ways answer less satisfactorily, than in changes which run counter to popular prejudice or general custom in old-standing forms of taxation.

Mr. Dowell refers to the difficulty of realizing the increase in the duty for the Exchequer, owing to the very small quantities taken by the majority of the purchasers, as follows:—

'Persons who are accustomed to purchase cigars and boxes of tobacco in pound and half-pound canisters, may perhaps be surprised to hear that seven-eighths of the tobacco consumed in the Kingdom is said to be consumed by the poorer or working classes, the bulk of

of it in half-ounces, and that the sale of single cigars exceeds by far the amount sold in boxes. As to cigars, indeed, arrangements might be possible; but as regards tobacco, the difficulty was considerable. The standard price of the half-ounce had for years been fixed at the rate of 3*d.* the ounce. How, with our coinage, could the additional 4*d.* the pound be apportioned to the 32 half-ounces? . . . the smaller purchasers had to put up with a slightly inferior article. Weight was added to the tobacco in the form of water; and to this day "moist Aquarius melts in daily showers" over many a tobacco chest, to recoup the retail trader some portion of the 4*d.* of 1878.—'History of Taxation,' 2nd edit., vol. iv., p. 271.

There has been, since 1878, only one important change of indirect taxation. This occurred when Mr. Gladstone, in 1880, swept away the Malt duty, and substituted for it a duty on Beer; all restrictions to the use of materials by brewers being removed. Whether in consideration of the freedom thus given, or from the natural tendency of a Chancellor of the Exchequer to give the 'down scale' on the side of the Revenue whenever a tax is altered, Mr. Gladstone arranged the new system of duties so that the yield of the tax on brewers and publicans was, according to the figures in the 'Statistical Abstract,' increased by 564,000*l.* a year.

With the exception of this alteration in the collection of an indirect tax, there has been no serious attempt made to increase the yield of indirect taxation since, in 1874–75, Sir Stafford Northcote retained the Income Tax as a permanent part of our system of taxation, till Mr. Goschen's Budget of this present year. There have been several occasions since, when additional taxation has been required, and there is no question, that the condition of the working classes is more prosperous now than it was in 1874. There is no doubt also, that the condition of many in the classes above them has become worse within the same limits of time; and that this has been the case among the most numerous and the most needy payers of Income Tax, little tradesmen and possessors of small incomes. The only taxes, which reach the bulk of the working classes, are the indirect taxes, while all Chancellors of the Exchequer, who have ever spoken on the subject, are eloquent on the severity of the pressure of taxation on the classes immediately above the level of the superior artisan. Yet, while the one class has not been taxed more severely, though benefiting largely by the lower price of all articles of consumption, the other classes of the community have had to bear the brunt of taxation. Between the commencement of the fiscal year 1876 and the close of the fiscal year 1887, for instance—the years ended 31st March are taken in both cases—the

the

the Customs duties have remained nearly at the same level, the amount being in round figures 20,000,000*l.*, both at the earlier and the later dates, and the Excise duties are about 2,000,000*l.* less, having moved downwards from 27,000,000*l.* to 25,200,000*l.*, while the tax on Property and Income has risen considerably more than 11,000,000*l.*, having been raised from 4,109,000*l.* in 1876 to 15,900,000 in 1887. The population has increased considerably between these two dates; hence the Customs and Excise duties are a distinctly smaller proportional charge per head at the present time than ten or twelve years since.

We have now to revert to the arrangement, carried out by Sir S. Northcote for making an annual diminution in the National Debt. This has, on the whole, been very successful. Like all measures of the same kind, it is open to the objection, that it depends on the will of the Government for the time being, and really can only operate efficiently while a genuine surplus is maintained. A little check, and it is gone. Thus, in 1880-81, a portion of the new Sinking Fund was employed to meet some extra charges arising out of the war in South Africa. Worse than this, it was virtually suspended in 1885 by Mr. Childers when Chancellor of the Exchequer. Even when this was done, there was a deficiency of no less than 2,600,000*l.* in the year, a deficiency which, had the whole charge been met, would, according to the Budget estimate, have reached about 7,500,000*l.* This was after adding 2*d.* to the Income Tax. The Sinking Fund was again altered, not, it may be hoped permanently, by Mr. Goschen in 1887. Mr. Gladstone, when speaking at Dover, December 28th in the same year, referred to this in some very caustic remarks directed against Mr. Goschen, who, he said, 'was thought to be a rigid financier and political economist, but, notwithstanding, he found himself this year quite at liberty to take away 2,000,000*l.* from a fund carefully constructed, in a spirit of longsighted statesmanship, for the reduction of the National Debt, and to apply it to the more popular purpose of taking a penny off the Income Tax.' While Mr. Gladstone could comment thus on the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, he must have forgotten that two members of his own Cabinet had done the same thing, and even one of them a great deal more; and, as it seems, with his approval. In 1885 Mr. Childers took, as mentioned above, about 5,000,000*l.* from the same fund, and Sir William Harcourt, the next year, suspended the operation of the minor Sinking Funds—an amount of about 800,000*l.* It is true that, after the reckless appropriation of these resources, made by his immediate predecessor, Sir W. Harcourt's action appears at first sight

sight less blameworthy than that of Mr. Childers; but both financiers only drift with the current. This happened to be a little less strong in 1886 than in 1885, but both Budgets really admit the same thing; that, without remodelling our fiscal system, we have, when additional revenues are required, no immediate resource but to increase the Income Tax, that is, to tax one section of the community. We can only echo the wish which we once heard expressed, that we could but have heard the speech which Mr. Gladstone would have made, had this tampering with the Sinking Fund been the work of a Minister to whom he was in opposition.

But the quarrels of statesmen are not within our province. Mr. Childers proposed in 1885, besides the additional 2*d.* in the Income Tax, an increase of the duty on beer and on spirits. These alterations were, like Sir S. Northcote's alteration of the tobacco duty, not well arranged. The tax on spirits is already enormous, and to propose an addition on beer always requires great courage. Both proposals were dropped. Had Mr. Childers proposed only an addition to the Beer duty, he might have been more successful. As it was, the remainder of Mr. Childers's Budget was virtually adopted, almost in its entirety, by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach when he succeeded him at the Exchequer in the summer of that year. Mr. Childers's plans, for dealing with the light-gold coinage and reducing the rate of interest on the National Debt, were neither of them successful.

Our chronicle of the fiscal legislation of the last quarter of a century is now approaching completion. Mr. Goschen's Budget of 1887 may be regarded as a provisional arrangement. His Budget of 1888, which we shall now proceed to consider, is framed on different lines.

Two main ideas are contained in it. The first, the reconstruction of our whole system of finance, necessitated by the assistance to be given to Local Authorities in lieu of the present ill-considered method of grants in aid. The second, the resolution not to depend solely on the Income Tax for additional revenue required in ordinary times. 'Generally,' said Mr. Goschen, in his opening remarks, 'it falls to the lot of Chancellors of the Exchequer simply to have to consider the claims of the taxpayers to the remission of taxation; but on this occasion the claims of the ratepayers have also to be considered; and I find that I have, if I may use the phrase, a double set of clients—namely the taxpayers and the ratepayers.' In order to make the points referred to entirely clear, a little explanation is required. The present financial system of our Local Government is both complicated and obscure. It has grown  
up

up out of a series of compromises between the Central Government and the Local Authorities. These have worked out after the following method. The Central Government has required certain duties to be performed in rural districts and country towns, and the inhabitants have virtually said to the Government, 'These matters may be attended to, provided you will pay for them.' The points contended for principally referred to health and to some branches of primary education. Thus, payments for medical officers under the control of the Poor Law authorities, Teachers in Workhouse Schools, Registrars of Births and Deaths, Public Vaccinators, part of the expense of the Police and Criminal Prosecutions, and other similar charges, have been regarded as expenses to be borne by the taxpayer, as separate from the ratepayer. As modern developments have established fresh wants, fresh grants have been supplied by the Central Government. Gradually, in this manner, payments to Local Authorities have accumulated to an amount of more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions annually, in England and Wales alone. The system is bad in itself; it is likely to promote extravagance, and it is not the best method to secure efficiency. The subject has been approached by many administrators in succession, but hitherto never successfully.

The measure recently introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Ritchie, promises to provide a very able basis for settling this thorny question. Hence it was incumbent on Mr. Goschen, not only to supply the funds needed to take the place of the grants in aid hitherto given to the Local Authorities, but to rearrange a very large part of our whole financial system. Speaking broadly, grants in aid of Local Taxation in England and Wales to the amount of 2,600,000*l.* will eventually be discontinued, and the proceeds of certain taxes, simultaneously raised to 5,500,000*l.*, will be handed over to the Local Authorities. The sources, from which this amount is to be derived, are partly existing and partly new duties, and include the principal part of the licenses now levied. These produce about 3,000,000*l.* a year, and embrace licenses on publicans, duties on servants, game licenses, and the carriage tax. To assist the new Local Authorities in the maintenance of the roads, a new set of licenses is proposed, which, broadly speaking, will be levied on all other vehicles, except those taxed at present, and agricultural carts and waggons. The license duty on horses kept for pleasure is to be reimposed, the justification for this mode of taxation being the commonsense reason, that those who assist to wear the roads out should assist to maintain them. Besides these taxes, half the Probate duty on Personal Property is eventually to be

be assigned to the same purpose, and this, with one or two minor charges, brings up the total to the sums before mentioned. By following this method, Mr. Goschen will cause Personal Property to contribute towards local expenditure—an end long desired—but which no financier has yet been able to attain. The void thus left in the receipts of Imperial Taxation is to be filled up, partly by an increase in the Succession duty and by a revision of the Stamp duties, partly by an increase of the duty on wine imported in bottle. A diminution of a penny in the Income Tax is the main remission, besides some minor alleviations in the incidence of the carriage duty, and the licenses on hawkers.

Space does not permit many further details being given. Mr. Goschen's practical knowledge was curiously exemplified by a saving of some 15,000*l.* effected by him, through watching more closely the balances at the Bank of England than has hitherto been done. The main features of the Budget are the skill shown in dealing with Local Finance, and the method of dealing with the Income Tax. Mr. Goschen stated, that he felt impelled, both 'from great Imperial considerations and from the point of view of the weight of the Income Tax upon the professional classes,' to reduce this tax as he has done. Mr. Goschen's mode of dealing with this tax raises the hope, not only that he shares Mr. Gladstone's aversion to it, but that he will endeavour, through a rearrangement of the indirect taxes, to avoid the necessity of perpetually leaning on it. Mr. Goschen was able to give the remission in the Income Tax with the better grace, as the additional taxation proposed falls mainly on the well-to-do. It is possible that modifications in some of the minor duties proposed may eventually be made; but the broad features of the Budget—the method of dealing with Local Finance, and the mode in which the taxes on income and property are treated—mark it as affording a hope of a new departure in our fiscal annals. At present the proposed alterations can scarcely be regarded as more than sketched out. This consideration should check premature criticism, and might have restrained the opinion expressed by Mr. Gladstone in the debate on the Budget resolutions, that the measure was one 'too much in favour of property and too little in favour of the general consumer,' which indeed was scarcely borne out by the remarks with which he supported that proposition. A discussion, conducted 'in the dry light of experience of public policy, with a complete estrangement from party or Parliamentary considerations,' would scarcely have led an entirely impartial financier to propose



propose an increase in the burdens which must inevitably fall on the failing industry of agriculture. It was singular and instructive to hear Mr. Gladstone repeat his proposals, for equalizing the taxation on property in mortmain, made originally many years since. His remarks on Mr. Goschen's Budget all reflected one idea, to focus taxation on one point—the cardinal error in Mr. Gladstone's financial policy. Mr. Goschen was fully justified in his reply, that the whole population would gain through the changes proposed.

The success which has attended Mr. Goschen's plans for the conversion of the National Debt, the very substantial assistance which will hence result to the taxpayer, must materially strengthen the position of the Government of which he is a member. No similar operation on so large a scale has ever been conducted before with anything like the same results. The definite figures are not yet known, but there can be no doubt that, while 'dissents' have been extremely few, willing and uncompelled 'assents' have come in to a far greater amount than even the most sanguine expected.

The skill shown in this measure, and in the rest of Mr. Goschen's financial plans, will greatly smooth the way for the acceptance of the County Government Bill which the Ministry has introduced. There can be no question that, both with the House of Commons and the constituencies, the Government stands now in a far more powerful position than it did either a year ago, or even when the present Session commenced. Financial strength has the enormous advantage, that it enables a Government which possesses it, to pursue its course in other directions, and towards beneficial legislation, unaffected by the agitation of the moment. To pursue this point further, however, would compel us to cross the boundary line to which in these remarks we have steadily adhered, that which separates fiscal matters from politics. It is a misfortune for the country that they are so closely interwoven. To cite one or two instances of this; had a registration duty of a penny per cwt. on the grain and flour imported into the country been open to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, this would have provided him with a larger amount than will have to be scraped up by no less than six of the minor taxes he has proposed, the imposition of which will be attended with a friction disproportionate to the result. A second penny on corn registration would have gone a long way towards enabling him to dispense with the new taxes on vehicles and horses. A penny on the cwt., it may be observed, is equivalent to fourpence on the quarter. No dispassionate financier can have any doubt which course would  
disarrange



disarrange the internal trade of the country least; but, while there can be no question, that even the higher of these two duties could not produce the slightest effect on the selling price of the article taxed, the loaf of bread, every one can imagine the vehement, though groundless, cry of 'Protection,' which such a proposal would excite, or the equally irrational demonstration, which a reimposition of the Timber or Sugar duties would call forth.

Mr. Goschen defended his tax on bottled wines, intended to be a tax on champagne, though it will, incidentally, fall heavily on cheap sparkling German wines, and similar growths also, by stating it was a duty intended to hit luxuries. The same argument would have justified a tax on silk goods imported; but here again the cry of Protection would have been raised. The allegation might just as well really have been brought against the tax on bottled wines. The 'home production,' however unrecognized, of sparkling wines will no doubt be assisted by the additional tax. Those who convert the juice of the gooseberry and other liquids into the nominal produce of sunny champagne will receive a considerable, though unavoidable, advantage. But we must not go further into the economic question embraced in this enquiry. The popular version of the principle of Free-trade in this country, true as the principle itself is, has passed into the position of a dogma, based on traditional prejudice, rather than on rational conviction. Taxes imposed for the purpose of Revenue ought not to take into account the question of Protection or Free-trade. The true principle, we take it, is this. A tax for Revenue ought not to be imposed, because it will protect some native industry; nor, on the other hand, should a statesman be debarred from imposing such a tax, if for other reasons desirable, because it will incidentally be of advantage to some particular trade in his own country.

This summary of recent national finance shows, that it has been divided into two main lines, parallel we may say in their course, but leading to destinations diametrically opposite to each other. There has been a diminution in the number of channels, to some six or eight, through which the Revenue is collected; and a tendency to raise the increased funds, which are now required, by an enlargement of direct, rather than of indirect taxation. Some persons, however, would even diminish our existing indirect taxation. To them the following remarks from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Hon. Charles S. Fairchild, for the year 1887, may be commended.

'But

‘But it is not well either to abolish or to reduce internal-revenue taxation; it is a tax upon whiskey, beer, and tobacco, things which are in very small measure necessary to the health or happiness of mankind; if they are necessary to any unfortunate man, they are far less necessary even to him than are a thousand other articles which the Government taxes. This tax is the least burdensome, the least unjust of all the taxes which Government lays or can lay upon the people; each man has a choice to pay much, little, or none of it, as he chooses to use much, little, or no spirits, beer, or tobacco; it should not be abolished, nor should it be reduced if, with due regard to the existing conditions of labour and capital, sufficient reduction can be made in the taxation of articles which are of necessity in the daily use of all the people.’

Mr. Fairchild continues as to the Customs duties:—

‘Add to the free-list as many articles as possible. Reduce duties upon every dutiable article to the lowest point possible; but in ascertaining these possibilities the present situation of labour and business must always be kept in mind.’

These remarks re-echo, to a great extent, those made by Sir George C. Lewis, and cited a few pages back. We take it they mean this. Tax if you can things which are not really necessities, but, if you cannot raise a sufficient revenue from these, strike a great many articles with a small tax. After all, this only comes back to the proverbial advice, not to put too many eggs into one basket. We, as a Nation, have an immense number of eggs in a very few baskets. Thus Stamps, Land Tax and House Duty, Property and Income Tax, produced about thirty millions in the financial year 1887; while spirits and tobacco produced about twenty-six millions. The sweeping remissions of taxes made by Mr. Gladstone have been so exhaustive, that they have outrun any possible power among the remaining taxes to recoup the loss to the Revenue. Our normal net charges now are over eighty-five millions. The gross expenditure of 1886, reckoned after the same manner, would have mounted up to something like one hundred millions. Parliament practically admitted then, it may be said unanimously—for in that fiscal year the financial arrangements were virtually the work of both sides of the House of Commons—that a deficit would have to be allowed, on account of the difficulty of adding at once to the supplies, without causing undue pressure on particular classes in the community. This arises from the want of elasticity in our existing system. During the last twelve years, any increased revenue which has been needed has been raised by additional direct taxation; meanwhile the

expenditure tends, and probably must tend, to increase, from causes which it is needless to recapitulate. This then is the outcome of the system of concentrating the collection of revenue on a very few and not very well-selected points—due to Mr. Gladstone. The opinion of those who, more than twenty years since, thought that the work of the pruning-knife should be stayed, is amply justified. A financial system, to be complete, should not only place as few shackles as possible on individual enterprise, but it should be so constructed as to admit of expansion whenever a sudden increase of requirement takes place. But no system, which is based only on a few points, like ours, can possibly effect this.

We would offer an ungrudging tribute of thanks to Mr. Gladstone for his conduct in transacting the French treaty, and for the administrative skill exhibited in attending to the details of the Revenue, as was shown, for instance, by the augmentation gained when the Beer-duty was substituted for the Malt Tax. We may also here pay due honour to the marvellous thoroughness with which he mastered, and the lucidity with which, in his Budget speeches, taking them as a whole, he set forth the most intimate details connected with the lines of trade and manufacture that he has successively dealt with. But here we must pause. It is impossible, even following the lines of Mr. Gladstone's own argument, to continue the praise further. Mr. Gladstone has denounced, and no one more strongly, the ill-effects arising from the continuation of the mode of raising the public Revenue with the Income Tax as the pivot on which all the system turns, but he has perpetuated that method. He has concentrated the source of supply on a few large heads, though an arrangement of that description is condemned by the soundest authority. The system, which has come into force through his acts and his example, is one which, even in comparatively easy times, is completely wanting in elasticity, so that a small addition, when further supplies are needed, is almost unattainable without alterations which would amount nearly to complete reconstruction. It is a system which, in a period of acute pressure, would have to be abandoned entirely. It might not be ill-suited to easy times, with a condition of increasing prosperity and stationary expenditure; but it is a pregnant source of national danger in difficult days when prosperity is at a standstill, or waning, while expenditure is increasing.

When the history of British Finance during this century is definitely written, the statesman, who has influenced it so long, and who deliberately hewed down that stately growth of indirect

rect but productive taxation, which had borne the plentiful fruit that carried the country through years of difficulty, and left only a scattered and maimed remnant standing, will certainly not be held up as a pattern to succeeding Chancellors of the Exchequer to follow. They will say: the years of happy Fortune were the years while he was in office; but did he husband carefully the resources of the country, or did he act as if sunshine and prosperity would last for ever?

Mr. Gladstone himself referred in his Budget speech of 1861 to the tree of golden leaves, whose fame was sung by Virgil, as representing our indirect taxation. He described in the words of the Poet how, when one branch was torn away, another rose in its place; 'and then,' he added, 'advice is given, which we have done well, and shall yet do well to follow:—

'Ergo altè vestiga oculis, et rite repertum  
Carpe manu.'

Had Mr. Gladstone refrained then from further destruction, how different and how far stronger our financial position would have been. But the inability to stay his hand is as fatal to the financier as to the man. With the growing demands on the Exchequer, combined with the absence of active expansion in the resources of the country, it cannot be long before the alterations in the system of indirect taxation, made during the last five-and-twenty years, will have to be reconsidered. Such a reconstruction must always be a hard task. But for the enormously increased weight of difficulty, which in our case will have to be met, the financial statesmen of the future will, we fear, hold Mr. Gladstone mainly responsible.

---